BV
3785
.M7W3

MOODY
VERSUS
CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
BT 3785
Shelf .M7W3
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

MOODY

VERSUS

Christ and His Apostles.

A VINDICATION

—OF—

THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL.

BY

JOHN TOMLINE WALSH.

ALSO, A CHAPTER ON

MODERN REVIVALISM.

—BY—

JOSEPH H. FOY.

No. 2449

ST. LOUIS:
JOHN BURNS, PUBLISHER.
1880.

BV3785
.M7W3

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON

Copyrighted by
JOHN BURNS,
1880.

Stereotyped by ST. LOUIS TYPE FOUNDRY.

MOODY

VERSUS

Christ and His Apostles

PRELUDE.

Mr. D. L. Moody has almost a world-wide reputation as a revivalist. He is well-known as such in Great Britain and America. In many cities of the United States, his name is a household word. Thousands have attended his preaching, and many have professed "conversion" at his meetings. These things being so, it will not be thought strange that public attention should be directed to him through the press. Indeed, many of his sermons have been reported and published by the secular press, and, in this way, as well as in books, they have become public property; and as such, are legitimate subjects of criticism. And this is the work to which I shall devote these pages. I think Mr. Moody has done good, and I award to him all honesty and sincerity of heart and purpose. But, while cheerfully conceding this, I think he has failed, signally failed to "declare the whole counsel of God," and hence, his good is mixed with much evil. In this examination of his

preaching and teaching, it will be my pleasure to give him credit where credit is due, and where the word of God compels me to differ from him, the same honesty and sincerity of heart and purpose I concede to him, will constrain me to expose error and to vindicate the truth as it is in Jesus Christ.

With these preliminary words, I will enter at once upon the work before me, by directing attention to Mr. Moody's position on the word of God.

CHAPTER I.

THE WORD OF GOD.

Mr. Moody seems to have a knowledge of God's word, and to revere its teaching. In one of his sermons on Faith, he uses this language:

"Now, God is not a man that He should lie. Has he not said it, and shall He not make it good? I may disappoint myself; my own heart may deceive me, but God never can deceive me; and, as some one has said, they know more about God's heart than they do about their own; how true it is! God has been true these 6,000 years. Men are untrue everywhere away from God, but God, all these 6,000 years, has been TRUE TO HIS WORD."

Now, the sentence which closes the above paragraph, is a noble one. God has always been, and ever will be, "true to His Word;" but men have often been false to themselves, and untrue to God and His word; and whether Mr. Moody is an exception to this just censure will be seen hereafter. But let us hear Mr. Moody again:

"Now I hear some people talking about faith—the faith that they have for some things, and I tremble because they have not got any *warrant in the word of God.* What do I mean by that? I mean if I should take 300 men with empty pitchers, and with lights in their pitchers to go out and meet a great army (as Gideon met the Midianites), *without a direct command from God*, I would be thrashed. That is all; they would rout me. But

Gideon had a warrant. HE HAD GOD'S WORD. He told him to go; that was enough; and when we find in the Scriptures, 'Thus saith the Lord,' that is enough; that is our warrant; there we have it right in God's word, and all we have to do is to come to Christ."

In the above quotation, the italics and capitals are mine, to call special attention to the language used by Mr. Moody. I am glad to be able to place him so emphatically on the side of God's word, and I shall have occasion, in the course of this review, to refer again to these emphatic declarations.

The word of God is the only divine rule of our faith and practice, as I shall now proceed to demonstrate. God said to Moses: "But the prophet (or teacher) which shall presume to speak a word in My name, *which I have not commanded him to speak,* or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die." Deut. xviii: 20. Again: "What things soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." Deut. xii: 32. Again: "Every word of God is pure." "Add thou not unto his words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. xxx: 5, 6. It is a fearful thing to "add" to God's word, and an equally fearful thing to "diminish" from it. To do either is a daring and presumptuous sin. David says, "Forever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven." Ps. cxix: 89.

When a man "rejects the word of the Lord, what wisdom is in him?" Jer. viii: 9. Well might God say by his prophet: "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let

him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Jer. xxiii: 28, 29.

If religious teachers have "dreams" to tell, let them tell them as dreams, and not seek to impress upon the minds of the people that they are revelations from God. The people as a general thing, do not know enough about the word of God to discriminate between his teaching and the teaching of men. between the inspired and life-giving words of Jesus, and the wild and fanatical utterances of some enthusiastic speaker, whose imagination has been fired, but not from the "altar of God."

Passing to the New Testament, we have the divine utterances of "*that prophet*," who is greater than Moses, David, Isaiah or Jeremiah. Let us "hear HIM," for He "speaks as one having authority" to speak, "and not as the Scribes." "For He, whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto Him." John iii: 34. Let it be specially noted that Jesus Christ, whom the Father sent into the world as His Apostle,

"SPEAKS THE WORDS OF GOD."

And let it be further noted, that "a man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven." John iii: 27. Keeping these important statements in mind, we shall be careful to try every man's teaching and preaching of what sort it is, and to discriminate between that which comes from heaven and that which emanates from men. "All Scripture, given by inspi-

ration of God, is profitable for doctrine (teaching), for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." II. Tim. iii: 16, 17.

May we not, then, justly claim that the Scriptures inspired of God are an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. Note the following important statements of the Apostle: 1. The Scriptures are inspired of God. 2. They are profitable for doctrine or teaching. 3. For reproof. 4. For correction. 5. For instruction in righteousness. 6. Then follows their grand design: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Can anything else be needed? Does the church of God or the world require anything else? If the Scriptures can make the man of God perfect, and completely fit him for *every good work*, all other things, as rules of faith and practice, must be superfluous. Again: What more reasonable than this, that as we are to be judged by the word of God as a rule in the last day, we should govern ourselves by its teaching in this life? Jesus says: "The words which I have spoken, the same shall judge you in the last day." John xii: 48.

This is a "thus saith the Lord," which makes the word of God, the infallible rule of life and of judgment. Truly, "the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, *and passing judgment on the thoughts and intents of the heart.*" Heb. iv: 12, as rendered by Dr. Jacob.

"The Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus;" and he who preaches must "preach the word." Thus he charges Timothy: "I charge *thee*, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom;

PREACH THE WORD.

Be instant in season; out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine"—teaching. "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." II. Tim. iv: 1–4.

In the above quotation the words "thee" and "their" in italics, have no corresponding words in the Greek. The charge is a general one, applicable not only to Timothy but to all who preach. And the false teachers and the taught not only turn away their own ears from the truth, but the ears of other people; and the ears of all are in this way "turned unto fables."

Many men claim that they are "called to preach," that "the Holy Spirit moves them to preach." It is a pertinent and important question to ask, *to preach what?* Are they simply "called to *preach*," without any regard to what they are to preach? Is it left optional with them what they preach? May they preach what they please without any regard to the

authority of Jesus Christ? I venture to affirm that God never called a man to preach anything but His own eternal truth, nor did the Holy Spirit ever move any one to preach a spurious or perverted gospel. When God called Jonah, He said to him: "Go preach the preaching I bid thee." As God's messenger, he must deliver God's message, and not one of his own! And so now, if God calls, or the Spirit moves persons to preach, they must, as God's ministers, deliver God's message to men; not a part of it, but the whole of it—"the whole counsel of God;" and if they fail to do this they give proof either that they are not called, or, if called, that they are perverting God's message by adding to it or taking from it. When God calls men he does not merely call them to preach, but to "preach the word;" nothing more, and nothing less. Paul said: "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel;" not "woe is me if I *preach not,*" but "woe is me if I preach not THE GOSPEL." So, if we have any duty in the premises, our mission is not merely to preach, but to "preach THE WORD."

Let me now direct attention to what Mr. Moody says about

DEAD CREEDS.

He says:

"We must know who we believe; we must know what we believe, and we must know that that belief is in a risen Christ, not some dead doctrine, not some dead creed, not in some theology. We have got to look away from all these things to Christ."

Mr. Moody's language is neither grammatical nor ornate, but the *thoughts* expressed above. have the right

ring. True, we do not know exactly what he means by "dead doctrine," "dead creed," and "dead theology." And it would be interesting for him to explain more fully to what "doctrine," "creed," and "theology" he has reference; and all of which he characterizes as "dead." And how did these remarks fall upon the ears of those sober Presbyterians assembled in the Fourteenth Street Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, Mo. Perhaps he did not mean to apply the term "dead doctrine" to the "Five points of Calvinism," nor to the "Five points of Arminianism." And, then, as to the "dead creed" and the "dead theology," what of them? Did he refer to that venerable old creed, "the Presbyterian Confession of Faith," or to the "Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England?" In short, did he not burn his own fingers in thus denouncing the household gods of the various "evangelical (?) denominations?" Be all this as it may, there are, in the estimation of Mr. Moody, some "doctrines," "creeds" and "theologies" that are "dead," and I am glad of it, and would add, let them be buried, for by this time their odor is offensive.

Creeds are the organic or constitutional laws of sects or denominations, without which the sect or denomination would have no separate and independent existence. This is an important truth, and demands an emphatic utterance. Take any sect or denomination in the world, and destroy or abolish the human creed or organic law which holds it together and gives it a separate and an independent existence, and it would cease at once to be a sect

or denomination. The creed or organic law of the Episcopal Church, is in the prayer book. The creed or organic law of the Methodist Episcopal Church is contained in the discipline. And this is true of all other denominations and sects. The creed makes the sect. The creed is the organic law of the sect. Abolish the organic law or creed, and you abolish the sect. Creeds are the production of human authority. Men look at the Bible through the creed, and interpret it by the creed. And, hence, sectarians believe what their church believes, and their church believes what they believe; and, hence, they and the church believe the same things! And this is the reason they give for the hope that is in them. All sects or denominations, therefore, are based on human authority, held together respectively by human creeds or organic laws enacted by men, and have no warrant or authority from God at all.

The Church of God is a divine institution. Its creed is divine. Its organic law is divine. Its foundation is Jesus Christ; its organic laws are in the New Testament, and all its other laws, institutions, and ordinances are there. Destroy or abolish a human creed, and you destroy or abolish the sect which holds it. But to destroy the Church of God, or the Church of Christ, you must destroy Christ himself, who is its foundation, and the New Testament which contains all its organic and legislative authority. There is no human element in it except the materials which compose it—men and women—who are believers in Christ Jesus.

We turn to the various denominations and ask

each one, *Is your creed from heaven or of men?* What answer can they give? If each one replies, *from heaven*, then we ask: Are they all alike? And they are compelled to answer, *no*. Then they are not *all* from heaven, for God is not the author of confusion. He never made one creed for one denomination, and another for some other denomination, much less is He the author of the more than legion creeds which divide and curse the Christian world.

The Church of God or Church of Christ, individually called Saints, Christians, or Disciples of Christ acknowledges no human authority, no legislative power. Christ is "Head over all things to the Church," and hence a human creed, as the foundation, covenant, or bond of the Church, must be rejected, if we would not dishonor Him, who is the only Lawgiver and Judge of His people. Eph. i: 22, iv: 15; Col. i: 18. Mr. Moody says, "We must look away from all these things to Christ." This is right. Let all the Christians in Christendom "look away" from all the "dead doctrines," "dead theologies," and "dead creeds," to a *living Christ*, "the Head of all principality and power," and very soon "like kindred drops they will mingle into one."

I am glad Mr. Moody has alluded to the question of creeds, and only regret that he has not more fully explained and defined his position. General remarks are not enough. His position before the public demands that he be explicit in his statements, and he owes it to himself, to the various denominations, to the Church of Christ, and to God Himself to tell the world what "creeds," "doctrines,"

and "theologies" are "dead," and which are not. I call upon him to brand by name all these "dead" things of which he speaks, and so put the Christian world on their guard respecting them. As a great evangelist of world-wide fame, he cannot, dare not remain silent on a question fraught with so much importance to the people of God and the world.

The Christian's creed, the word of God "is *living* and powerful." The Spirit of God is in it, and operates through it upon the minds and hearts of men. What spirit operates through human creeds? The spirit of party, of division, of schism, of sectarianism. Each sectarian creed has its spirit, and that spirit is the spirit of the denomination holding the creed. And it is not an unfrequent thing for the spirit of the party to be mistaken for the spirit of Christ, and the love of the party to be mistaken for the love of Christ; and a zeal for the party to be mistaken for zeal for Christ and His truth. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

"I now leave the subject of "dead creeds," and proceed to examine what Mr. Moody says on faith.

CHAPTER II.

ON FAITH.

And on this point I will let Mr. Moody speak for himself. He asks, "What is faith?" and then proceeds to say:

"The best definition I can find of faith is that one given in Hebrews: 'Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.' It is the dependence upon the veracity of another. It is the foundation really, of all good society. If you hath not faith in the bank where your money is, it would come out before you went home to-night, if you could get it out. If you have a sick child, and you have lost faith in the doctor, you soon discharge that doctor. You can see it really is the foundation of society, and you cannot offer a man really a greater insult than by telling him that you have not any faith in him."

Now this general definition of faith is not bad; it has the true ring, and while it might be improved, is quite well illustrated. But we must hear him again. His next thought is that

WITHOUT FAITH WE CANNOT PLEASE GOD.

He says:

"Scripture tells us that God cannot be pleased without faith. It is impossible to please God without faith. Well, it is impossible to please men really without faith. Many a man has been knocked down on the streets of St. Louis, because some

body has given him the lie, has told him that he is a liar. Well, the plain English of "unbelief" is this:

GIVING GOD THE LIE.

You turn over to the Epistle of John, v: 10, and it says: 'He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son.' Now that is just what unbelief is. It is giving God the lie, that we won't believe his testimony. We take the testimony of men, but we won't take God's testimony; we believe what men say, but we will not believe what God says."

Then, after speaking of the untruthfulness of newspaper statements, and how men credit them, especially if they be of an injurious character, Mr. Moody adds:

"But when God bears His record, His testimony for His Son, men are not willing to take God's testimony. They are not willing to believe it."

He then proceeds to speak as follows of

SAVING FAITH.

"Now, saving faith has, as you might say, three things. There is *knowledge*, *assent* and *laying hold*. I may intellectually believe a thing. I may believe that getting on a train of cars will take me to Chicago or New York if nothing happens, but if I don't act upon that knowledge it don't help me. I may give my assent to it and say, 'yes, I believe that,' but I have got to act upon it. I may be hungry, and there is bread, and I may say, 'I believe that bread will satisfy my hunger,' but if I don't eat the bread it will not help me. I may be sick, and I may know, and I may give my assent that a certain medicine will help me, but if I don't take the medicine, if I don't act upon the knowledge, if I don't lay hold it won't help me. And so a man may know that Christ can save him; that He has the power to save him; but if he don't lay hold of Christ he won't save him."

And, after giving various other illustrations of faith, and alluding to a little boy before him, who had faith in his father and mother, he continues thus:

"And now what we want is the same faith. It is the same kind of faith. God has linked faith and salvation together. It is a decree of high heaven. 'He that believeth hath'—it don't say that he shall have when he comes to die—but he 'hath,' present tense, right here to-night. 'He that believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life; and there is not a thing to hinder every person in this house from believing on the Son now and being saved if you will."

I have quoted largely from Mr. Moody, without making many comments; but just here I have something to say respecting his definitions of faith. He divides faith unto "knowledge, assent, and laying hold." I do not regard this as correct, but arbitrary and fanciful. Had he reversed his order it would have been less arbitrary, and it certainly needs to be transposed. Had he put "assent" first, as the weakest degree of faith, and followed it with "laying hold," and put "knowledge" last, the arrangement would have been more in accordance with the truth. His illustrations of this part of his subject are all in agreement with his definitions, and, hence, faulty and objectionable.

The phrase "lay hold" occurs in I Tim. vi: 12–19. Heb. vi: 18. Paul exhorts Timothy to "lay hold of eternal life, whereunto he had been called." And he was commanded to instruct others to "be rich in good works, etc., that they might lay hold of eternal life." And in Hebrews, Paul speaks of the "strong consolation" of those "who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us," etc.

Faith is simply belief on testimony. If the testimony be human, the faith is human. If the testimony be divine, the faith is divine. If the testimony be weak, the faith will be correspondingly weak. If the testimony be strong, the faith should be correspondingly strong. Besides the *nature* or kind of evidence, there is much in the *object* of faith. The faith of the Gospel has Christ for its supreme or highest object. It relates to a divine person, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Son of God; as having died for sin; as having arisen from the dead; as being crowned in heaven "Lord of lords and King of kings;" as the great High Priest of our profession, and as "head over all things to the Church, which is His body." Faith in Christ is faith in a living, personal Saviour, and the highest degree of faith is *trust*. Eph. i: 12, 13. "That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first *trusted in Christ*. In whom ye also *trusted*, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, etc". The Ephesians first "heard the word of truth," then "trusted" in Christ. And "after they *believed*," and not before, "they were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." This is the divine order or arrangement which cannot be changed. The "knowledge" of salvation comes by the remission of sins. Luke i: 77.

Mr. Moody puts it pretty strong when he says, "a man may *know* that Christ can save him; that He has the *power* to save him; but if he don't lay hold of Christ He won't save him." I think the term

"know," like the same term in his illustration about the "medicine," is too strong, and by no means the proper one. A man may *believe* that Christ can save him, as some did when He was on earth, and through the influence of various motives never confess Him. But as a man cannot "*know*" that a certain medicine can cure him until he has tried it, and has realized its healing power; so "*If any man will do His will,* he shall *know* of the doctrine (teaching) whether it be of God," etc. John vii: 17.

Mr. Moody's exegesis of John vi: 47. "He that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life," is an evidence of carelessness on his part. There is a vast difference between having *a right* or title to "eternal life," and having it in possession. All Christians are *heirs* of that life, but whether they will inherit it or not depends on a faithful "continuance in well doing." This truth is confirmed by many Scriptures, and requires no labored argument to sustain it. But the use which Mr. Moody makes of the text is pernicious. It is true that, "He that believeth on the Son *hath life;*" but not "eternal life." To this he has only the *title.* "Eternal life" cannot be *lost*, if in actual possession; but the *title* to it may be *forfeited*, and so the blessing itself never enjoyed. But according to Mr. Moody's interpretation, every one who believes in Christ has eternal life in possession, and can never be lost; which, in a somewhat different shape, is the old doctrine of "once in grace, always in grace," which, of course, in Mr. Moody's esteem, is not one of the "dead theologies." So much for the perversion of a text.

But let us hear Mr. Moody tell

HOW FAITH COMES.

"Now, how does faith come? 'Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.' I am nowhere told to increase my faith by praying for faith. If I had spent the time in years gone by studying the word of God, and getting acquainted with God, that I have spent in praying for faith, I think I would have been further on in the Christian life than I am now. It is astonishing to see so many people in the church *closing up their Bibles*, and not looking into them from one year to another as a study, *and praying God to give them faith.* Now, faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God; and if a man knows the word of God he will be acquainted with God, and will have faith in Him. Just see what it says here in the Gospel of St. John: 'That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name.' Now this blessed gospel *was written* that ye might believe, and that believing ye might have life through His name. *This is how you get faith; it is by the word.*"

This is certainly sound teaching. It has the ring of the old Jerusalem blade, and demonstrates that Mr. Moody is not ignorant of the word of God; and that he can at least, "see men as trees walking." He speaks on this point "as the Oracles of God," and has so fully declared himself that he cannot go back. Let us now hear him on

FAITH *versus* FEELING.

"As I said in the opening of the lecture, it is not feeling; faith is not feeling; there is a good deal of difference between faith and feeling. One person has used the illustration, and I think it a very good one. He says there are some people in the church who are all the time *living on their feelings.* And it is feel, feel, feel, and you can't talk with them but they begin to talk about their feelings. And he represents them like a sailing vessel out at sea. Where there is a good breeze they get on

very well, but if there come up contrary winds they are driven about in every direction; but a man that has got faith is like one of those great steamers; he plows right along against the wind, and against the waves, and against the tides, making good progress night and day."

This is sufficient on this point. It is evident Mr. Moody places faith above feeling, neither does he predicate faith on feeling. If he was not so well known, one might be led to suppose he had united with the Church of Christ, and was a Christian preacher! But we know where and how he stands, and although he has spoken many things which are good and true, he has failed to preach the whole gospel, as I shall show hereafter.

Mr. Moody says truly:

"If we trust in God we are not going to be confounded. If we trust in one another, if we trust in churches and creeds instead of a loving Christ and a living Savior, we are going to be disappointed. Then there is an idea among people, being common now-a-days, that

IT DON'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE WHAT A MAN BELIEVES, IF HE IS ONLY SINCERE.

How often you hear it: It don't make any difference what you believe; it is immaterial what a man believes if he is only honest. That is all—to be sincere. One religion is just as good as another. One doctrine is just as good as another if you are only sincere. *I think that is one of the most pernicious doctrines that was ever taught on this earth.* I believe that is one of the lies that came from the devil himself. Don't make any difference what a man believes if he is only sincere? What an absurd idea! The most sincere men that I have ever heard of were the false prophets of Baal, on Mount Carmel. I have not seen any in America, as sincere as those men were. Look at them there, 400 prophets of the grove and 450 prophets of Baal, leaping on that altar and cutting themselves with knives until the blood ran all over their bodies. And there they are panting and crying to the god Baal to come

and help them. They were terribly in earnest. They were terribly sincere, but there was no answer to their prayer, there was no answer to their cry. A man has built a house. He builds it on the sand. Why, it is just as good on the sand as on a rock, if he is only sincere about it. That is all. What is the difference? You need not look for a foundation; if you believe that the sand is just as good as the rock, it is just as good, if you are only sincere about it. I give a man a check for $500, and he says to me, 'Have you any money in the bank?' I don't know, but I am in earnest. I give you the check. *I mean business.* There is the check. 'Well, but have you got any money in the bank?' Well, I don't know, but I am terribly in earnest about it. There is your check. All you have to do is to be sincere—to be honest and sincere—that is all. It is not what you believe.'

There is a bridge yonder and its foundations are bad, rotten, and you know if a train goes over it, down it will go. But then if you are sincere, it is all the same. What is the odds? A rotten bridge is as good as a sound one if you are only sincere. That is the doctrine of the world now, and the cry now. You are not to look at the doctrine. You are to have faith in every thing that comes along, only just be honest, just be sincere. A lie is just as good as the truth, if you are only sincere. I had a man tell me that since I have been here in St. Louis. He said that persons were blessed in believing a lie, if they were only sincere in it. That is all—just to be sincere."

I have not quoted all Mr. Moody says on this point, but this is enough. This, in the minds of thousands both in and out of the church, is the great delusion of the present day, and Mr. Moody takes the proper view of it. His position is well taken, and could be illustrated and enforced by hundreds of Scriptural and other examples; but he has argued it so well, and presented it so strongly, I do not deem it necessary to add more.

I now approach one of Mr. Moody's positions on

faith, from which I am compelled to dissent. It really seems strange that a man of his apparent knowledge of the Scriptures, should so seriously blunder after all the good and true things he has said about faith. But he is evidently, (I hope not hopelessly), in the old theological rut of

FAITH ALONE.

This is the "sandy foundation" on which thousands build, and, because they are "sincere," think it all right. But I am glad Mr. Moody, though he holds the dogma, cannot predicate its safety on the ground of "sincerity" and "honesty." But let us hear Mr. Moody himself. He says:

"We get a new life by *just believing* with all our heart upon the Son." Again: "There is nothing to hinder every person in this house from believing on the Son now and *being saved* if you will." Again: "There is no reason in the wide world why we should not have faith in Him; why we should not lay hold of Him by faith right here *to-day* right here *this very hour* if we will. Now, if there is a person in this audience out of Christ and he wants Him, you can become His, *this* VERY MOMENT if you will just take Him by faith," etc. He represents men as "lost one minute and saved the next," which about equals the lines written with reference to a sinner who was thrown from his horse and killed:

> "Between the stirrup and the ground,
> He pardon sought and pardon found."

Once more:

"If there be a man here who is the slave of any passion or lust, I say unto him that the Son of God came into the world to destroy the works of the devil and deliver you from the power of Satan; and he wants to deliver not only you, but to deliver every soul, and you can if you will, *be saved this very minute.*"—GLAD TIDINGS, page 111.

Mr. Moody not only teaches that men are saved by faith alone, but also that they are saved the *very moment* they believe in Christ; and "that salvation is instantaneous." Hear him:

"I want to prove to you that salvation is instantaneous. It is just as *sudden* as a man walking through a door-way. One minute he is on this side, the next he is on that side."—GLAD TIDINGS, page 226.

Mr. Moody gives quite a number of illustrations of this his favorite notion, but they are farfetched and forced into his service unscripturally and illogically. As examples he uses the "door way," "Noah going into the Ark," and the Israelites taking "one look" at the brazen serpent; all of which, he claims, proves that "faith only," "one step," one single "look" is enough! Types, when properly understood and interpreted, are beautiful illustrations of truth; but when misunderstood and misapplied they serve only to darken counsel, and such is the use Mr. Moody has made of them. He declares that

GOD HAS LINKED SALVATION AND FAITH TOGETHER.

And this is true, but it is not all the truth. Faith alone does not save. Faith is a principle of action. Faith does something. Even Mr. Moody seems to recognize this, for he says, we "have got to act upon it." He speaks of a "faith that will *take us* to Christ." Faith leads to obedience, and men are saved by "the obedience of faith," and not by faith alone. Faith works—does something—leads to obedience to the commandments of God. "By faith Abel *offered* unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain;" "by faith Enoch *walked* with and *pleased* God;"

"by faith Noah *prepared* an Ark;" "by faith Abraham *obeyed*;" and so of all those ancient worthies of whom Paul speaks in the 11th chapter of Hebrews. In every dispensation of God to men, while the acts of obedience have not always been the same, salvation has always been predicated on *faith and obedience.* I use the term *salvation* as synonymous with pardon, remission, justification and forgiveness, which seems to be the sense in which Mr. Moody himself uses it. He says:

"Some men say, 'I wish I knew just how to be saved.' And he replies: 'Just take God at his word and trust his Son this very night, and this very hour, and this very moment. He will save you if you trust in him.'"—GLAD TIDINGS, page 106.

No inspired apostle ever gave such an answer as that to an *intelligent* inquirer after salvation. I say intelligent, because the Philippian jailor may be supposed to be an exception. But more of his case hereafter.

In order to understand the gospel plan of salvation, we must

RIGHTLY DIVIDE THE WORD OF TRUTH.

Christ appeared in the end of the Jewish age; He was born under the law, fulfilled it, and by His death and resurrection abolished it.

During His personal ministry, as "He had power on earth to forgive sins," He pardoned sinners with or without conditions as it pleased Him. In proof of this consult Matt. ix: 2–6; Mark ii: 10; Luke v: 21; Luke vii: 47–49. When Christ was on earth, He exercised His authority or power in forgiving sins in accordance with the circumstances and con-

dition of the person pardoned, without regard to any uniform rule or conditions, except such as he saw fit to impose in each respective case. And then He pronounced the pardon *with His own lips.* His *word* gave them the assurance of forgiveness. This statement applies to all the cases where He, in person, absolved persons from their sins. And it applies with peculiar force to the "thief on the cross," that theological scape-goat, whose case has been made the occasion of disobedience on the part of thousands, aided by such teachers and preachers as Mr. Moody, who can see no difference between the personal exercise of Christ's authority during His ministry on earth, and the provisions of that Last Will and Testament, which was sealed with His own blood; and to which, thus confirmed and sealed, no one can add anything, and from which no one dare subtract one single jot or tittle. Paul settles this question beyond all dispute: "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Heb. ix: 16, 17. Now, the testator, Jesus Christ, was yet living when He said to the thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise," which language clearly implies the forgiveness of his sins, as in the many other cases of which we read in the gospels. The case of the thief belongs to the same class, and must be disposed of in the same way. Christ had not yet expired. The New Will or Testament had not yet been sealed. The general law of pardon had not yet been promul-

gated. The Apostles or Ambassadors of Christ to the world, had not yet received their commission. The thief was the last sinner personally pardoned by Christ before He expired on the cross, and he is no example for any one now, except such as may desire to live in sin and disobedience to the last moment, and, then, when they can no longer serve the devil, turn their dying eyes to heaven, and give the ashes of a mis-spent life to God. I have no faith in "death-bed repentance," particularly where grand and glorious opportunities have been thrown to the winds, and persons have deliberately rejected the Gospel of Christ. It is not true that

> "While the lamp holds out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return."

And while the pardon of the thief is a beautiful illustration of the amazing condescension and love of Christ to a sinner hanging on the cross beside Him, and who, perhaps, for the first time has had an opportunity of knowing the character of Jesus, it is no example for sinners now; nor does his case come under *the general law of pardon* authorized by Christ, and promulgated by His apostles.

I have thus paved the way to a presentation of the general and uniform

LAW OF PARDON.

And in discussing the general and uniform law of pardon under the gospel, I will quote the commission and demonstrate that *salvation* is not by "faith alone," as Mr. Moody and others teach.

"And Jesus came and spake unto them saying:

All power (authority) is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach (*Matheteusate*-disciple,) all nations, baptizing them (the taught-discipled) into (*eis*) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them (the baptized) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: And, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. xxviii: 18–20.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi: 15, 16.

"Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv: 46, 47.

"Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when He had said this He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." John xx: 21-23.

Here we have the

GREAT COMMISSION

given by Christ to his apostles, and under which they preached. All their preaching and teaching was in strict accordance with their commission. They could not preach anything not in harmony with it. They

were "to tarry in Jerusalem until endowed with power from on high." Luke xxiv: 49. They were "commanded not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of me." Acts, i: 4. During the interval between the death of Christ and the day of Pentecost, they were silent, but "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," they were "endowed with power from on high," and entered upon their high mission of preaching the gospel.

Let me pause here, and briefly state the requirements of the commission as given by the Evangelists: According to Matthew, First, The nations were to be taught or discipled. Second, They were to be baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Third, They were to be taught to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded.

There is no "faith alone" here; but the people are to be taught and discipled, and then baptized. Here discipling and baptizing are "linked together" by Him who has "all authority in heaven and in earth," and "what the Lord has joined together let none put asunder." And, remember, that the teaching or discipling precedes the baptism.

According to Mark, first, the gospel is to be preached; then, secondly, follows faith in the gospel, and, thirdly, baptism.

There is no "faith alone" here, but *faith* and *baptism* are "linked with salvation" by Jesus Christ Himself, the One eternal Law-giver!

Luke mentions, first, Repentance, and, second, Remission of Sins. And these were to be preached

"in the name," or by the authority of Jesus Christ, "BEGINNING *at Jerusalem.*"

There is no "faith alone" in Luke's statement of the commission; indeed, he does not mention faith at all, though it, as well as baptism, is implied. Here "repentance and remission of sins" are "linked together" by divine authority.

Now, taking the testimony of Matthew, Mark and Luke, and what does the commission require in order to "*salvation*" or the "remission of sins?" It clearly requires FAITH, REPENTANCE, and BAPTISM. From this conclusion there is only one way of escape, and that is by denying the authority and word of Jesus Christ. We have a "thus saith the Lord" for all that is taught in the commission.

Its faith, repentance, and baptism are backed by the Lord of heaven and earth. And, remember, Mr. Moody says: "God has linked salvation and faith together." He says: "'A thus saith the Lord' is enough." That "God has been true to His word for 6,000 years." I hold him to these declarations with hooks of steel. "Thus saith the Lord," "He that believeth *and is* BAPTIZED shall be *saved.*" Does Mr. Moody believe this? Does he preach it? If not, why not? How can he, or any one else, suppress a part of God's message to the world? How can he, or any other preacher, mutilate the Commission of our Lord? Has not the Lord Jesus Christ "linked" salvation with faith, repentance, and baptism? Is it possible Mr. Moody has not seen it? Cannot see it? I suppose Mr. Moody teaches repentance, but in his book of sermons, called "*Glad*

Tidings," embracing about 500 pages, if there is a discourse on the subject of repentance I have failed to find it! This, to me, is a strange and singular omission. In some of his discourses he may have intended to cover this ground, but, if so, he has failed to make prominent this important condition of salvation; a condition which is closely "linked" with faith, and should always precede baptism.

But I am not yet done with the Apostolic Commission. There is something peculiar in it as recorded by John. Christ says to them: "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

It is important we should understand this language. Were the Apostles invested with authority to forgive sins? Are we to understand this language in the Romish sense, that the Apostles were invested with authority to absolve penitents from all their sins, or to pronounce absolution?

The language of Christ to Peter may throw some light upon this question: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. xvi: 19. Again: "Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Chap. xviii: 18.

From the above we learn that, the authority given to Peter, (with the exception of the keys, which will be explained hereafter), was subsequently given to

all the Apostles. And again we learn that the investment of this authority was then *future*, just like the building of Christ's Church. He said, "*I will* build," not I have built. And "I *will give* unto thee the keys," etc.

The Apostles were the Ambassadors of Christ; they were clothed with plenary power, and were guided by the Holy Spirit into all the truth. They spake by inspiration of the Spirit, and, hence, their words were the words of God, of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit; and hence of Peter it was true, that whatsoever he made binding on earth, was ratified or made binding in heaven; and whatsoever he loosed on earth, or did not make binding, was not made binding in heaven. And this plenary power or authority was conferred on all as in the 18th Chapter of Matthew and the 18th verse, where the same language is addressed to them all. All this authority was necessary to qualify them as His plenipotentiaries to the world. They were appointed to treat with men in His name, and full power to do so must be conferred upon them. Hence, whatever they made binding in the name or by the authority of Jesus Christ was binding on earth and in heaven!

And whatever they loosed, left loose, or did not make binding on earth, was not made binding in heaven. I am satisfied with the correctness of this exegesis, and believe it is the only one admissible.

Now, we are prepared to examine the commission as recorded by John, where our Lord says: "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

These words evidently confer absolute power and authority to proclaim to the world *the terms or conditions of remission of sins.* They had full power to announce the conditions of pardon. They acted in Christ's stead; spoke for Christ, and those who heard them, heard Christ; and those who heard Christ, heard the Father! "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that heareth me, heareth Him that sent me." Luke x: 16.

Now, what did these spirit-inspired Apostles preach? Did they preach in harmony with the commission they had received, and under and by virtue of which they acted? If they did not, they were untrue to the trust confided to them, and were guilty of high treason against "the Lord of lords, and King of kings." That Mr. Moody and thousands of others do not preach the commission, is a fact patent to all who understand the "way of the Lord."

Peter had "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and was the chief speaker on the day of Pentecost. The Apostles were "all filled with the Holy Spirit," and spake "as the Spirit gave them utterance." They preached the gospel. Multitudes of the people were "pierced to the heart" and cried out: "*Men and brethren,* WHAT SHALL WE DO?" Their weal or woe hangs upon Peter's answer! A mistake now will be fatal not only to them, but to all future generations of men who may inquire the way of salvation. Life and death, heaven and hell, hope and despair, salvation or condemnation all hang upon the words of "Peter and the rest of the Apostles." What answer will they give? What answer would Mr.

Moody have given? The answers he now gives to the thousands who inquire what they must do to be saved, are the answers he would have given then. He does not *now* think "'A thus saith the Lord' enough." He does not preach the commission as Peter did, nor give the answer he gave. But let us hear Peter's answer. It was true and infallible! It was not a *figurative* answer. It was not hyperbolical. Hope and fear now tremble in the balance in the hearts of his hearers, and every ear is strained to catch the answer that shall seal their doom. Peter looks down on their upturned and anxious faces, and gives God's answer, the answer of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit to their question. And what was it? Was it "A thus saith the Lord?" *It was!* And here it is: "*Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*" Acts ii: 38.

There is no "faith alone" here. These people had faith when they asked, "what shall we *do*?" And Peter told them to "*repent* and be *baptized* EVERY ONE OF YOU in the name of Jesus Christ," or by His authority, "*for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." These are the things Peter made binding on earth, and they were ratified or made binding in heaven. These are the conditions of remission which are covered by "whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Christ, in the gospel, has ordained a uniform law of pardon, and that law is briefly expressed in the words: "He that believeth (the

gospel) and is baptized shall be saved." And just here it is in order to quote from Mr. Moody again:

"Now, I hear some people talking about faith—the faith that they have for some things, and I tremble because they have not got any warrant in the word of God. What do I mean by that? I mean if I should take 300 men with empty pitchers, and with lights in their pitchers to go out and meet a great army (as Gideon met the Midianites), without

A DIRECT COMMAND FROM GOD,

I would be thrashed. That is all; they would rout me. But Gideon had a warrant. He had God's Word He told him to go; that was enough; and when we find in the Scriptures, 'Thus saith the Lord,' that is enough; that is our warrant; there we have it right in God's word, and all we have to do is to come to Christ."

Now, then, I have given the direct command from God" that men must "repent and be baptised for the remission of sins," and what will Mr. Moody do with it? Will he "take God at his word," or will he "reject the word of the Lord" as Saul did? It is in place just here, for him to "tremble" on his own account—for his own want of faith in God's word.

The reader will pardon my great plainness of speech, and the manner in which I speak of Mr. Moody, whose positions and statements I am reviewing. He has set the example. He is a bold man, and speaks without reserve. And in this examination of his religious faith and practice, I intend to dig a deep ditch around him, throw up intrenchments, cast up breast works, build forts, and mount his own guns, and turn them against him! If he is inconsistent, and even contradictory, it is no fault

of mine. He is a public man, and his sermons, and even his prayers, are published in the newspapers and in books, and scattered broad-cast like autumn leaves; and his preaching and teaching are legitimate subjects of Biblical criticism. But let me return to my subject, and in doing so I will quote the words of Peter in Acts iii: 19. "Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Here we have *repent* and *turn*, for the word *convert* means to turn, and is so translated in many places in the Scriptures. No "faith alone" in this passage, but it is substantially the same as in Acts ii: 38. True, Paul says we are justified by faith, and by *the* faith; but he nowhere says we are justified by "faith alone." And when he speaks of justification *by faith*, in contrast with justification *by works*, he always has reference to "the works of the law," and not to "the obedience of faith." This is so obvious that it really seems to me, it requires no argument to sustain it. And, then, in some places he uses the article before faith, and speaks of it as "the faith" in contrast with "the law," and evidently means by the phrase, "the faith," the gospel as opposed to the law. In proof of these statements I refer to Rom. iii: 25–31; Chap. v: 1. Gal ii: 16, 17; Chap. iii: 2–5. See, also, verses 8 to 27 inclusive.

Abraham himself was not justified by "faith alone." James says: "Was not Abraham our father justified *by works*, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought

(*worked*) with his *works*, and *by works* was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only," or alone. James ii: 21–24.

"Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone," says the Apostle. And again: "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

Mr. Moody advances nothing more pernicious than salvation by "faith alone." This is the rock on which he wrecks "the *obedience* of faith." It is here he misleads the honest seekers after light and salvation. And he is not alone, for thousands of preachers repeat and echo the same thing.

Mr. Moody told of a lady who said she "had been seeking Christ for three years," and asked, "What would you do, then?" Said he, "*Do nothing, only believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.*" "Oh," said she, "I have heard that till my head swims. Everybody says, Believe! believe! believe! and I am none the wiser." GLAD TIDINGS, page 423.

And this is just what Mr. Moody and thousands of others do. He says: "John's gospel is the great one. Believe, believe, believe, he says." GLAD TIDINGS, page 484.

Mr. Moody says, if a sinner desires to know what he must do to be saved, he would direct him to the gospel of John! Has he yet to learn that the Acts

of Apostles contains the only full and complete answers to that important question? The historical books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, were written to establish the claims of Jesus Christ; and in them we have the great facts of the gospel; His birth, life, miracles, teaching, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension to heaven; and, in the language of John, it is true: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ; the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name." John xx: 30, 31. But while this is true, it is nevertheless a fact that, the Acts of Apostles contains, full and complete, the proper answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" There, and nowhere else, can the penitent believer find what he must do in order to the remission of his sins. And only in one case was the answer simply, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts xvi: 30, 31, 32, 33, 34. The Philippian jail was a heathen, a pagan. He had no faith. And therefore Paul, "as a wise master-builder," told him to believe. This was the first thing to be done. The jailor took Paul and Silas into his house. "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." And the "jailor was baptized, he and all his straightway." The jailor and his family were not saved by faith alone, nor is there such a case on record in the Acts of Apostles. Notice, no one but the jailor was present at first when Paul told him to believe,

but now "they spake unto him the word of the Lord and to all that were in his house." "Faith comes by hearing the word of God." They heard it, believed and were baptized "the same hour of the night;" and so "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house."

Before dismissing the subject of faith, on which I have dwelt at some length, and to which I may have occasion to allude again, I will examine what Mr. Moody says on the sentence

"WHEN HE SAW THEIR FAITH."

The above words may be found in Matt. ix: 2, Mark ii: 5, and Luke v: 20. The case was that of a man having the palsy. Those having him in charge, finding no access to Christ through the door on account of the multitude, "went upon the house top, and let him down through the tiling, with his couch, into the midst before Jesus." Then we have the words: "When he (Jesus) saw *their* faith, he said unto him, *Man, thy sins are forgiven thee.*"

This miracle has been paraded before the public of late years in sermons and books for a special purpose. Mr. Moody has a whole discourse upon it, and his argument is, that the man himself had no faith; that Matthew, Mark and Luke do not say he had any faith; that Jesus "honored the faith" of his friends, and healed him because they had faith. His language is: "I believe that that whole miracle is to teach us; that that whole lesson is to teach us Christians that God will honor our faith." "Christ looks up, and when he saw their faith—not the man's faith;

it don't say that he had any—He saw their faith—that's the point."

On this I will remark that while the Evangelists do not say the sick man "had any faith," they do not say he had no faith! Why should Mr. Moody limit the pronoun "their" to the sick man's friends exclusive of himself? Does the language demand it? It certainly does not. The pronoun "their" is used with reference to the whole group, and not with reference to a part of them; and the legitimate conclusion is, that the palsied man had as much or more faith than his friends.

But Mr. Moody's position is that he had no faith, and that Christ "honored" the faith of his friends, and not only healed him physically, but also *forgave his sins without any faith on his part!* Thus, it will be seen, Mr. Moody overdoes the matter, and not only teaches that Christ so "honored" the faith of his friends as to heal him of the palsy, but also so "honored *their* faith" as to forgive a man who had no faith! This caps the climax of faith! It predicates remission of sins on the faith of others! It sets aside a personal faith, a personal trust in a personal Savior! This man was cured and pardoned by a proxy-faith! What now becomes of all the fine things Mr. Moody has said about a personal trust in Christ?

"The legs of the lame are not equal." "That which proves too much, proves nothing." Mr. Moody is lame, inconsistent, and contradictory in his teaching. He is a surface man, and jumbles thoughts and things together without order; and utterly fails

"rightly to divide the word of truth." He is a scrap-doctor, quotes the Scriptures at random, and then misapplies and misinterprets them. As an illustration of what I have just said, I will quote the following: "How long did it take the Lord Jesus Christ to heal that man? Some men say, 'O, we don't believe in instantaneous conversions.' How long did it take the Lord to heal the man of the leprosy? One word, and away went the leprosy."

Had Mr. Moody known what "conversion" is, he could not have written thus. As "conversion" is a "*turning* to the Lord," it can not be properly illustrated by the miracles Christ wrought, as it respects *time*, *manner*, nor *conditions*. In proof of this, without referring to particular cases, if the miracles of Christ, as it respects *time, manner*, and *conditions* of *cure* and *pardon*, are proper illustrations of conversion to Christ, then we not only have a great variety of methods, but some are required to do something, and others to do nothing; some are required to have faith, and others are converted without faith, unless, indeed, their friends can believe for them! *See Glad Tidings*, pages 21–31.

No wonder Mr. Moody strongly intimates that God will so "honor the faith" of his praying people, as to convert men hundreds of miles away! It surely is right to "pray for all men," but that God will so "honor the faith" of any one as to convert a sinner, who has no faith, hundreds of miles off, and that, too, without any other instrumentality—without his hearing, believing, and obeying the gospel, has no foundation in Scripture, reason nor common sense. If this

had been Christ's method of saving men, why could not the apostles have remained in Jerusalem, and have converted the world by faith and prayer? Would not Christ have "honored" *their* faith? And why send missionaries now to all parts of the world, to bear the glad tidings of the gospel to the heathen at an immense cost of men and money, when the work can be done by faith and prayer, God "honoring" them in the conversion of sinners? For, if God will and does so "honor the faith" of his people as to convert one sinner in this way, why not one thousand or one million, or even the world of the ungodly? I know God's providence is mysterious, and that "His ways are past finding out;" but He "can not," and "will not lie;" and that "His word is forever settled in heaven," and His gospel an "everlasting gospel," "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes it; and as "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," as Mr. Moody admits, no one can be saved without hearing, believing and obeying it. This is God's plan in reference to all, infants and idiots excepted.

Pedobaptists, and Mr. Moody is one, have used the text on which he bases his singular theory of salvation, to prove that the faith of the parents will save the children; and that they can, and should be baptized on the faith of their parents. I do not know that Mr. Moody goes as far as this, but if there be any foundation in truth in the hypothesis, it not only proves that the faith of the parents will save the children, but, also, that the faith of one or more men will save their neighbors! Is there any such teach-

ing as this in the gospel? To ask the question is to answer it. The truth is, that salvation is a personal matter; and that no one can hear for another; believe for another; repent for another; confess for another, nor be baptized for another. Every one "must give an account of himself to God." If these miraculous cures and pardons are to be taken as illustrative examples of salvation under the gospel, as to time, manner, and conditions, how are we to interpret the cure of the blind man? Jesus "spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, And said unto him, go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent). He went his way, therefore, and washed, and came seeing." John ix: 6, 7. Here is no "instantaneous" healing, but a process which ends in washing in the pool of Siloam; and all this, too, was personal, not depending on the faith of any one else. The truth is, none of these miraculous cases were ever intended by Christ to teach anything concerning the time, manner, or conditions of personal salvation under the gospel; but to demonstrate the divinity and Messiahship of the Lord Jesus Christ. And the manner in which they are used by Mr. Moody, and others of the *revival school*, is an utter perversion of them, and highly pernicious in its tendency. John tells us why these signs and wonders were performed and recorded: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these (signs) are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have

life through His name." John xx: 30, 31. This was the grand design of the Testimonies of Mark, Matthew, Luke and John, in their record of the wonderful miracles, signs and wonders performed by Christ, and not to indicate the *instantaneousness, manner*, nor *conditions* of salvation from sin under the Gospel Proclamation. And I trust the reader will treasure up this highly important statement in his mind, and not be carried away by the zig-zag, incoherent, random, and unscriptural preaching and teaching of Mr. Moody and others of his school.

CHAPTER III.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

On the subject of the Holy Spirit, its mission and work, Mr. Moody seems to be at sea without even starlight to direct him. He confounds the miraculous operations of the Spirit in the Prophetic and Apostolic ages, and makes no distinction between the miraculous gifts of the Spirit and its ordinary operation in the salvation of men. I have not the space to quote largely from him on this subject, but I must quote enough to do justice to his position and statements. And in order that I may the better meet his errors and correct some of the serious mistakes into which he has fallen, I will speak first of the Holy Spirit as

THE SPIRIT OF POWER.

The Spirit of God was present in the creation of the heavens and the earth. In proof of this I refer to Gen. i: 2. Job. xxvi: 13; Chapter xxxiii: 4. This was the exercise of physical power on inanimate things, and also in the creation of man and his endowment with life. As I shall have occasion to refer again to the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of power, I will now speak of him as

THE SPIRIT OF INSPIRATION.

All the ancient prophets were inspired by the Spirit of God. He is the Revealer, and has been in all ages the Spirit of Revelation. I can only quote a few passages on this point, nor need I do it, for Mr. Moody and all others interested will admit its truth: "All Scripture (is) given by inspiration of God, and is profitable," etc., 2 Tim. iii: 16; 1 Peter i: 10, 11, 12. 2 Peter i: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as moved by the Holy Spirit."

All God's revelations are from heaven, and hence: "A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven." John iii: 27. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. *But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit;* for the Spirit searcheth all things; yea, *the deep things of God.*" 1 Cor. ii: 9, 10. And as "no man knoweth the things of a man, save the Spirit of man which is in him, even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." Hence the Apostles "had received the Spirit which is of God," and knew "the things given them of God." See verses 12, 13 in full. What I have now said shuts off and excludes all modern inspiration and revelations.

An important point in this examination, is founded on the statement that,

THE HOLY SPIRIT WAS NOT YET GIVEN.

"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus

stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." John vii: 37–39.

Here we have a declaration which demands special attention. It is affirmed that "the Holy Spirit was not yet given, *because Jesus was not yet glorified.*" This is the reason given. And yet, we know the Holy Spirit had inspired the prophets in all the previous ages. This must be reconciled, for "the Scriptures cannot be broken." The "Scripture" referred to is obscure, but the Lord may have had reference to Isaiah lviii: 11, and to Chapter xliv: 3, 4, but it is more probable that he had reference to the general promise of the Spirit in the books of the Prophets, and specially to Joel ii: 28–32, which was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, after Christ was glorified.

But still a difficulty remains. The Holy Spirit had been given before in some sense, and to some persons. And, now, in reference to this matter, I will say, *that the Holy Spirit was given only to a few during the Patriarchal and Jewish Ages.* And it is by reason of this fact, that the statement in John (vii: 39), receives its force, at least in part. But under the Gospel, which is the "ministration of the Spirit," in contrast with the legal dispensation *all obedient believers receive the Holy Spirit,* thus verifying the declaration in John vii: 37, 39.

We may safely concede that Abel, Enoch, and Noah possessed the Spirit of God; and that with Enoch and Noah he was the Spirit of inspiration. Coming down this side the flood, we can enroll among the number: Shem, Abraham, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Solomon and all the prophets down to Malachi. There were a few others to whom God gave his Spirit for special service, or for a particular work, even to some whose hearts were not right in His sight, as in the case of Balaam, Saul and some others. But the main point I wish to state is this: *That, while the whole nation of Israel was regarded as the people of God, and so styled by God himself, yet only a small number of them had the Spirit of God. How, then, did they*

RESIST THE HOLY SPIRIT?

I will answer this highly important question; important because of its bearing on the whole subject.

"Ye stiff necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, *ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye.*" Acts vii: 51–53.

Stephen charges the Jews with always resisting the Holy Spirit; that they were "uncircumcised in heart and ears," and resisted the Holy Spirit "as their fathers did." And how did their fathers resist the Holy Spirit? By persecuting their prophets and rejecting the word of God spoken by them. Hear Nehemiah: "Yet many years didst thou forbear them, and *testifiedst against them by thy Spirit in thy prophets.*" Chap. ix: 30. Again: "Yea, they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should

hear the law, and the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent *in his Spirit by the former prophets.*" Zech. vii: 12.

This settles the question as to how the Israelites "resisted the Holy Spirit." They did not resist the Holy Spirit in themselves, nor operating in naked impact or compact with their minds or hearts; but they resisted the Holy Spirit which was in, and spake by their prophets the inspired teaching and divine commands of God.

Now, coming down to the birth of John the Baptist, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, I may remark that John's mission being a special one, he was "filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb;" and in the account of the wonderful events of those times, we learn that Zacharias, Elizabeth, and Mary, were all filled with the Holy Spirit; and the venerable old Simeon and the prophetess Anna also received the Spirit. And the Lord Jesus Christ received the Holy Spirit without measure, for "God gave not the Spirit by measure unto Him." John iii: 34. From this point there is no intimation that any one received the Holy Spirit until "Jesus was glorified," if we except the "power and authority" which He gave the twelve Apostles and the seventy when He sent them forth to preach "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" and that was the Spirit of power to "heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out demons," etc. Matt. x: 7, 8. Luke x: 1–17. As yet "Jesus had not been glorified," and His disciples had not been

BAPTIZED WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The first that we hear of this baptism is in the preaching of John the Baptist. Matt. iii: 11. Mark. i: 8. Luke iii: 16.

There is not a case on record of the baptism of the Holy Spirit before "Jesus was glorified." To baptize in or with the Holy Spirit, was the exclusive prerogative of

THE GLORIFIED LORD.

"I baptize in water," said John; "but *He shall baptize you in the holy Spirit.*" No prophet, apostle or evangelist ever baptized any one with or in the Holy Spirit, since the world began! This prerogative, power or authority was never conferred on man. The apostles were never commanded to baptize with the Holy Spirit, nor did they have the power to do it. This statement of fact is worthy of being remembered.

I now come to the

PROMISE OF THE SPIRIT.

"If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." John xiv: 15–17. Here we have the promise of the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, to the Apostles or Christ. He says of Him, "whom the world cannot receive," and gives two reasons, first, "because it (the world) seeth Him not;" secondly, the world

"knoweth Him" not. "But you," my Apostles, "know Him for he *dwelleth* with you" (in the person of Christ), "and *shall be in you.*" Again: Christ assured His Apostles that, "*He shall teach you all things*, and *bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.*" Again: "Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, *he will guide you into all truth.*" John xvi: 13.

Let it be noted that the mission of the Comforter to the Apostles, was "to teach them all things;" to "guide them into all truth." And let it be further noted that, the Comforter or Holy Spirit did not come until the day of Pentecost; that if Christ "had not gone away;" had not ascended to heaven; and had not been "glorified," the Comforter would not have come. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." Now we can fully understand why "the Holy Spirit was not given because Jesus was not yet glorified."

The Apostles were not baptized with the Holy Spirit until they were "endowed with power from on high," and they were directed to "tarry at Jerusalem" for this endowment; and after Christ had arisen from the dead, and just before his ascension, He "commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of Me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit *not many days hence.*" Acts i: 4, 5. I have now brought this point up to the day of Pentecost, when the Comforter came for the first time, and the dis-

ciples were baptized with the Holy Spirit; the first and only baptism of this kind up to this date. And now I am prepared to state, that the language in John xx: 19–23, does not necessarily indicate any immediate impartation of the Spirit to the Apostles, and cannot, indeed, be so construed, "because Jesus was not yet glorified;" nor was He glorified until he had been crowned in heaven; and then, and not before, the Comforter came. The Scripture above referred to, is evidently the commission as recorded by John, as I have previously shown.

I will now briefly direct attention to the

MISSION OF THE SPIRIT TO THE WORLD.

"The world cannot receive him;" but "when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." This was his mission to the world. He would reprove them, not by any special or direct operation upon or within them; not by first entering into them, for they *cannot* receive him, but in and by *testifying for Christ.* Hence, Jesus says: "*He shall testify of me.*" "And ye also," my Apostles, "shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." And again: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you: *and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem*, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." John xv: 26, 27. Acts i: 8. With this agrees the words of Peter: "And we are *His witnesses* of these things; and so is also *the Holy Spirit,* whom God hath given *to them that obey Him.*" Acts v: 32. Many other passages might be quoted, but these are suffi-

cient to establish the fact, that the Holy Spirit reproves or convicts the world by testimony. The evidence may be classed thus: 1. The testimony of the prophets. 2. The testimony of John the Baptist. 3. The testimony of the Father. 4. The signs and wonders wrought by Christ. 5. The testimony of the Apostles, and 6. All these attested by the Holy Spirit, who enabled the Apostles to confirm their testimony, and so vindicate and establish the claims of Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of the Living God. But was it of *all sin*, or of some *particular sin or sins*, the Spirit was to reprove or convict the world? Let the record answer: "*Of sin,* BECAUSE *they believe not on me: Of righteousness,* BECAUSE I *go to my Father, and ye see me no more*"—(no longer:) "*Of judgment,* BECAUSE *the prince of this world is judged.*" No one, I think, can read what I have now quoted, and not come to the conclusion that the mission of the Spirit, so far as the world is concerned, is to vindicate the claims of Jesus Christ, and to convict the world of *unbelief.* That is the great sin, and not sin or sins in general, such as lying, cheating, fornication, blasphemy, drunkenness, etc. To convict the world of these was not the purpose for which the Holy Spirit came down from heaven on the day of Pentecost, and baptized the Apostles! "By the law is the knowledge of sin"—all sins like these. Hence, it is clear that the "sin" referred to is that of *unbelief;* "because they *believe not on me.*" And it is the "righteousness" of Christ that is grandly vindicated by the Holy Spirit. He was condemned as a malefactor by "the prince of the world," and

when He ascended to His Father's throne, *the earthly sentence was reversed*, and the Holy Spirit came down in Jerusalem, where He had suffered death as a vile impostor and malefactor, and triumphantly and gloriously vindicated His high claims. And this is the way the Holy Spirit reproved "the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." And so, then and now, the Holy Spirit and the Apostles are His witnesses everywhere, even unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

Mr. Moody believes in the "baptism of the Holy Spirit" now, and even prays for it. In this he is not alone. Most preachers of the revival school profess to be baptized with the Holy Spirit, and some of them even add "the fire!" Indeed, they profess to be baptized with the Holy Spirit again, and again. They "pray for a fresh baptism." I need not dwell on this fact, for it is well known to all who have heard him preach or read his sermons. There are only two cases on record of the baptism of the Holy Spirit; one of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, and the other the family of Cornelius. In both instances "they spake with tongues and prophesied." In both cases *he came as a witness.* "And with great power gave the Apostles *witness* of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." Acts iv: 33. The Messiahship, divinity, and lordship of Jesus were fully sustained by the testimony of the Apostles and of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, by signs and wonders and mighty deeds. In the house of Cornelius the baptism of the Spirit was for a different purpose. On Pentecost it was to convince the world, reprove the

unbelieving, and establish the religion of Jesus. In the family of Cornelius it was designed to break down Jewish prejudice, demolish the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, so as to make of the twain one new man in Christ Jesus, and open wide the door of salvation to the Gentile world, that the gospel might be preached to every creature. Thus the Spirit was poured on "all flesh," according to the prophesy of Joel. And Paul, in speaking of the unity of the one body and the diversity of the spiritual gifts, and evidently referring to the baptism of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost and in the family of Cornelius, says: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, whether *bond* or *free;* and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. xii: 13.

This statement of the Apostle confirms my exposition of the baptism of the Spirit in the household of Cornelius, where "Gentiles," "bond and free," became members of the one body of Christ. True, the baptism of the Spirit in this case, preceded their obedience in baptism; but the reason of this may be found in the exposition already given, and in the words of Peter: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" Knowing the power of Jewish prejudice, he supposed his "six Jewish brethren" would object, and hence he puts the question. "And he *commanded* them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." When Peter went to Jerusalem some of his Jewish brethren "contended with him" about this matter, and he gives this testimony in justi-

fication of his conduct: "Forasmuch, then, as God gave them *the like gift* as unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God?" Acts xi: 17. It was in this way that God "bore them *witness*, giving them the Holy Spirit, even as to us; And put *no difference between us* (Jews) and them (Gentiles), PURIFYING *their* HEARTS BY FAITH." Acts xv: 8, 9.

The baptism of the Spirit was a witness—gave testimony, but "their hearts were purified by faith" in Christ, and then they were "baptized in the name of the Lord."

MR. MOODY'S CONFUSION.

Mr. Moody's utterances about the Holy Spirit are exceedingly confused. If he understands it, he has a very unfortunate way of expressing his thoughts. He prays to God to teach him what his work is. He says:

"O, may the Spirit of the Lord come upon us to-night, and may every one of us be taught by the Holy Ghost what our work is, and may we be ready to do it."—GLAD TIDINGS, page 53.

Now, what does he mean by this? The Holy Spirit teaches in words, the words of God. Does Mr. Moody expect to be taught in this way? Does the Spirit reveal to him or others what their work is? May not he, and all others, find their work in the Scriptures?

Again he says:

"Every holy man that has ever spoken in this world, has been *inspired* and *prompted* by the Holy Ghost, and has been moved by the Holy Ghost to speak; and if he has not been so moved,

the words are just like the clouds, they will soon be gone and be of no permanent effect." "They won't last; but the words that abide and live forever are the words prompted by the Holy Ghost, or accompanied by the Holy Ghost."

The above is a very sweeping declaration. Have all the good men, such as Mr. Moody calls "holy men," since the Apostolic age, been "inspired?" Were their words prompted by the Holy Spirit? These statements of Mr. Moody involve the notion of a special and divine call to preach, and it may be that Mr. Moody himself claims to have been "moved by the Holy Ghost to preach," and that he is "inspired." He certainly claims to be "anointed for service"—special service, and believes others are. But in reply to all this, I will say, That when men are "inspired" and "moved by the Holy Spirit to preach," they always deliver God's message pure and unmixed! Their utterances are consistent, harmonious and truthful. They preach the words, and not the dreams of their own distempered imaginations. And he who supposes or believes that all the preachers in Christendom, who are regarded as good or holy men, are "inspired," and were "moved by the Holy Spirit" to preach their vagaries, the "doctrines of men," the "traditions of their fathers, and the dogmas of a stale and scholastic theology, has a thousand-fold more faith than the writer; not faith in God, nor the word of God; but faith in the undigested speculations of men who are not "inspired," and were never "moved" by the Holy Ghost to teach or preach. It is sad to think how many contrary and absurd things are ascribed to the Holy Spirit; things which cannot

be reconciled with each other, nor with the word of God.

But let us hear Mr. Moody again:

"It would be very easy for the Holy Ghost to convict every man here of sin. Then shall we not ask him to do it? All that he has to do is to open a man's eyes, and he will see at once that he is a sinner." Again: "Why is it that when the Holy Ghost wakes up some men they get so angry?" "I do not believe a man was ever convicted of sin by any preacher in the world. It is the work of the Holy Ghost. If he does not do it they won't be converted."

All this in its crude and undigested form, is very strange.

But hear him again:

"He (God) has done everything that He could do toward your salvation. You need not wait for God to do anything more." —GLAD TIDINGS, pages 99, 281.

Perhaps Mr. Moody can reconcile these disjointed, incoherent, and clashing statements.

Again:

"What we want to do is to let the Holy Ghost work in his own way, and he will impart hope; and the Holy Ghost is very hopeful the moment he gets in!"

Once more:

"The Holy Ghost is our teacher. He will teach us and show us things to come."—G. T., pp. 278, 283.

Will the Spirit "show us things to come" *in* or *out of* God's word? Will he do it by communicating them directly to the mind, or must we read and learn them in his inspired word? Mr. Moody more than intimates that he will teach us directly! He

speaks of the Spirit opening the eyes—his eyes, and says—"some people do not believe in the supernatural working of the Spirit, and the supernatural power of his influence." Well, when the Holy Spirit opened his eyes, did he do it with or without the word, the gospel? Supernatural things are miracles, and if the Spirit of God now works supernaturally then he opens the eyes of sinners miraculously, and not by means of the word of God, the gospel of Jesus Christ. If this be so, will Mr. Moody or any one else, tell me how "faith comes by hearing the word of God," as he says it does; and "not by praying, feeling," or anything of that sort? Speaking of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, he says: "They must have been *converted by the power* of the Holy Ghost away back where it is said, "the Holy Ghost breathed upon them." And yet on page 469, referring to the same *breathing*, he says, "of course His disciples had been *converted before this!*" What a confusion of thoughts and statements we have here! They are very remarkable misquotations and contradictions coming from one who is "inspired and moved by the Holy Ghost to preach." He thinks we ought to be "imbued with power from on high;" that "we do not tarry at Jerusalem until we get the power;" and that we can be filled "with the Holy Ghost as were the early Christians." And then, speaking of himself, of his "anointing for service," he says: "But after four months the anointing came. It came upon me as I was walking in the streets of New York. Many a time I have thought of it since I have been here.

At last I had returned to God again, and I was wretched no longer. I almost prayed in my joy, "O stay Thy hand!" I thought this earthen vessel would break. He filled me so full of the Spirit."—G. T., page 471.

The reader will see from the quotations and comments already made, in what light Mr. Moody regards the operations of the Holy Spirit. Much more could be collected from his numerous sermons, but I have neither time nor space for more. I will add a few remarks

ON PRAYING TO THE SPIRIT.

This is another feature in Mr. Moody's teaching, and in the prayers of his co-laborers, which demands some attention. And just here I will remark that, there is not in the whole Bible, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, so far as known to me, a single instance on record, where saint or sinner, prophet or priest, Apostle or Christian every addressed a prayer *to* the Holy Spirit. This fact, if fact it be, merits special notice.

But this practice is very common with some religionists, and among such revivalists as Mr. Moody. On one occasion in St. Louis, when he preached on "the Holy Spirit," Dr. Brookes prayed, and among other things said: "May he (the Spirit) take of the things of Christ and *reveal* them unto us." Dr. Boyd prayed: "Breathe thy power into our hearts, O Thou most Holy Spirit, for Christ's sake."

Now, our prayers should be addressed to God, in the name of Jesus Christ. We may call *on* God

through Jesus Christ, *for* the Holy Spirit. It is right for Christians to pray for the Spirit, because it is promised to all that obey our Lord. Matt. vii: 11. Luke xi: 11–13. But sinners, unbelievers, cannot pray for it. They have not the promise of the Holy Spirit. Neither is it Scriptural for Christians to pray to God to "pour out His Spirit" on sinners. They "cannot receive the Spirit," and Christians have no authority to make such a petition. I have thus briefly adverted to this point, and will now close my remarks on this subject by answering the question,

WHO MAY RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT?

The Apostles received both the ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit on Pentecost. They alone had the power to impart special gifts of the Spirit by the imposition of their hands. These points need not be argued. But, beginning with the *Birthday* of the Church, Pentecost, Peter, in answer to the inquiry, "Men and brethren, what shall we do? replied: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, *and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*" They obeyed, and doubtless received the Spirit. Nor was this answer restricted to those present, for he immediately adds: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." The promise of remission and the Holy Spirit stands good in all the world, and throughout all generations upon those conditions. And in Acts v: 32, he declares that God had given the Spirit "to them that obey Him." See 8th chap. Romans.

Again, we read: "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father." Gal. iv: 6.

Christians are temples of the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. iii: 16, 17. "And if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. viii: 9. Christians should be filled with the Spirit. Sinners "resist the Spirit" by rejecting the gospel which is attested by the Spirit. Christians "grieve" and "quench the Spirit" in their own hearts by disobedience.

Mr. Moody himself says: "The Holy Ghost dwells with only those that have been cleansed by the blood." "We are washed and cleansed by the blood, and when a soul is washed and cleansed by the precious blood of Christ, *then* it becomes a temple for the Holy Ghost to dwell in!"

CHAPTER IV.

THE NEW BIRTH.

Mr. Moody is very "orthodox" on the new birth, as the following quotations will show:

"They are dead in sin until the Holy Ghost brings them to life, until the Spirit of God moves upon the waters. There is no life or power for a man to serve God *until he is first born of the Spirit*, until he has been quickened (*made alive*) by the Holy Ghost, until he has been raised as Christ's dead body was raised. So dead souls must be raised, and when they have been raised by that power, then they can serve God."—G. T., pp. 275, 276.

This is surely strong enough for even the hyper-Calvinist.

Let us hear him again:

"Some one said to me the other day that he understood about *belief*, but could not understand what it was to be born again. I told him that he that believed had life eternal, and whoever received life through Christ was born again."—G. T., pp. 4, 94.

Now, right by the side of the above, let me quote from his sermon on "Ye must be born again." He says: *He* (God) *has done everything that He could do* toward your salvation. You need not wait for God to do anything more." (G. T., pp. 98, 99). And still, man is "dead and has no life or power to *serve* God until he is *first born of the Spirit*." "God has done

everything that He could do." "You need not wait for Him to do anything more!" And yet you are dead, and cannot do anything yourself, cannot serve God, "until born of the Spirit;" "until made alive by the Holy Ghost;" "until raised as Christ's dead body was raised!" Tell it not in Gath! Publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the uncircumcised rejoice! And is this the gospel that converts so many people? Is this the gospel of the Holy Ghost? The poor man is dead, and is told he can do nothing. And, to cap the climax, he is told that God has done all He could, and that he need not wait for Him to do more!

Surely I need quote no more from Mr. Moody on this subject. I turn away from this Babylonish dialect, this confusion worse confounded, to

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.

Mr. Moody says "the church and the world are confounded" on the new birth, and yet that it is "important and *plain;*" that "it is the very foundation of our hope, and the very foundation of our religion."

It is no wonder that "the church and the world are confounded," with such teachers as he is to instruct them on the subject. And if it be as important as he represents it, it ought to be better understood; and if it is so "plain," it is strange that he, himself, does not understand it.

Nicodemus was a Jew, and had the faith and hope of a Jew. Like the rest of his people, he predicated everything on his Abrahamic descent. He was a representative man, and spoke the sentiments of his

people. "*We* know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do the miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." This, no doubt, was the general sentiment at that time. Our Lord paid no attention to this voluntary declaration of Nicodemus, but at once strikes a blow at all his fleshly hopes. John the Baptist had done this on a former occasion, when he said to the people: "And think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Matth. iii: 9.

Christ, in His conversation with Nicodemus, at once turns his attention away from his fleshly Abrahamic descent to a higher birth—a birth from above. And hence He says to him, "Except a man be born again, (ανωθεν—from above), he can not see the kingdom of God." Nicodemus has no conception of such a birth, and says: "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" Jesus replied: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again." John iii: 3–8.

Mr. Moody often mutilates the word of God, and in this way puts language into the mouths of the sacred writers which they never used. He does so in this case, when he quotes Christ as saying: "Except ye are born of the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God." But He did not say that; those are not His words, as any one can see.

Christ speaks of a birth and a kingdom. The birth from above is illustrated by the earthly or fleshly birth. The term *born* has only two senses—to beget, and to bring forth. It has no third sense.

The *process* of the new birth is the same. God, or the Spirit of God, begets. The instrumentality is the gospel. The seed is the word of God. The birth itself, or bringing forth is, *ex hudatos*, out of the water; and when this process is completed, then the man is "*born of water and Spirit*," as Christ says.

In proof of all I have here stated, I refer to the following scriptures: "He came unto His own (land,) and His own (people) received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on His name."

I pause here to state, that Mr. Moody often quotes a part of this text in his sermons; indeed, he says it is his favorite text; and yet, with all his regard for it, he mutilates it, and generally ends with the word "power." But the text is directly against him, and it is strange he does not see it.

Those who "received Him," who "believed on His name," to them, and them only, "He gave *power*" or privilege to "*become* the Sons of God." They were not already sons by "believing on His name" alone, but He gave them "power to become" what, as yet, they were not—"the Sons of God." Let the reader ponder this.

"Which were born (or *begotten*), not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, *but of God*."

The new birth originates with God, and is therefore from above.

As to the instrumentality, Paul says of the Corinthians: "I have begotten you *through the Gospel.*" I. Cor. iv: 15.

As to the seed, Peter says: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." I. Peter, i: 23.

And, as to the final act, or coming forth, it is *ex hudatos*—out of the water. It begins *ex pneumatos*, out of the spirit, indicating its source; and ends *ex hudatos*, out of the water. And, then, as the newly born infant inhales the air of heaven, so, "because you *are sons*, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

I agree with Mr. Moody, that the subject is "plain," but not as he presents it. But will the reader be astonished to learn that, notwithstanding it is "plain," Mr. Moody says it is "mysterious," and cannot be "reasoned out"? And, in proof of this, he quotes and comments on the 8th verse: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Nicodemus replied: "How can these things be?" Jesus answered: "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" Could Nicodemus understand it? Jesus seems to express surprise at his ignorance: "Art thou *a master* of Israel, and *knowest not* these things?" But "unbelief" was the main trouble with Nicodemus: "If I

have told you earthly things, and ye *believe not,* how shall you believe, if I tell you heavenly things?"

The 8th verse has been a bone of contention among theologians for generations. I offer the following brief exegesis:

1. I think there is no "wind" in the text, however windy men's interpretations of it may be. It is *pneuma* in the Greek, and is uniformly rendered Spirit throughout this chapter. But, whether it be wind or Spirit, the meaning of the text is the same, as we shall soon see.

2. Two things are compared—not their *mode* or *manner*, but the things themselves. The mode or manner of being born, is not the point in the passage. The comparison or illustration relates to the *person born*, already born, and the wind or Spirit, whichever word you adopt: "So is *every one* (every person) *that is* BORN *of the Spirit.*" The language implies that the *process of being born is completed*, and now, the *product* of the birth is like the wind or spirit in some way. *What is that likeness?* I answer, *freedom* or *liberty.* If we say it is the wind, then the wind is free; "it blows where it pleases." If we say it is the spirit, then the spirit is free. David prayed, "Uphold me by Thy free spirit;" and Paul says, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Jesus said to the Jews: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you *free.*" They said, "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, ye shall be made free." John viii: 32–36.

Jesus taught them that "Whosoever committeth

sin is the servant (or slave) of sin," and then adds: "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

3. All men living in sin are in bondage. The Jews were in bondage under the Old Covenant. Paul beautifully illustrates the new birth, and the liberty of those who are born again, or born from above, in the 4th chapter of Galatians. He speaks of being "in bondage under the elements of the world," until Christ came "to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the *adoption of sons.*" He introduces an allegory to illustrate the Old and New Covenants. "Abram had two sons, the one by a bond woman," Agar, representing the Old Covenant from Mount Sinai, "which gendereth" or bringeth forth children "to bondage;" "the other by a free woman." The son "by the bond woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman by promise." And he says "this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answers to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." What a beautiful illustration! The children of slaves are slaves. The children of the free are free. And all who are born again are free! They have the glorious liberty of the children of God! They should now stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free. They are born of God, born of water and spirit. They belong to the Family or Church of God, and Jesus Christ is their elder Brother!

CHAPTER V.

THE OBEDIENCE OF FAITH.

On the subject of obedience Mr. Moody speaks strongly, but in general terms. As the subject now in hand, is a very important one, I will let him freely speak for himself. Mr. Moody keeps Christ, faith and the Holy Ghost prominently before his hearers, but "fails to declare the whole counsel of God." He "rings the changes" on "Come to Jesus," but fails to tell the people *how* to come. It is "believe! believe! believe!" And when they ask, what must we believe? What is his reply? "You are to believe God's word; you are to take God at His word, and trust him for salvation."

This is certainly true, but it is expressed in general terms, and is not such an answer as a penitent sinner wants. "Every soul here to-night may be saved, if he will only take God at His word." "It is just simply believing on him."—G. T., p. 419.

Referring to the case of Saul and the Amelekites in illustration of disobedience, Mr. Moody says: "Now, Samuel says to Saul, 'To obey is better than sacrifice.' What God wants is obedience, and you have disobeyed him again." "Let us learn a lesson from Saul. Let us obey God. 'To obey God is bet-

ter than sacrifice.' It is obedience that God wants. You may ask, "What may I do to obey God?" You are just to believe on his Son and be saved. Will you obey Him to-day?"—G. T., p. 313.

Here was a fine opportunity for Mr. Moody to give the true answer, but he did not do it. He says enough about faith, but ignores "the obedience of faith."

And yet, while he "links faith and salvation" in such close proximity as to make salvation wholly dependent on faith, with no other condition expressed or implied, he does, in a few of his sermons, allude to repentance; though, if his views of faith and salvation be correct, the order must necessarily be, faith, salvation, repentance!

But let us hear him on repentance: "Any man or any woman here to-night, who will repent and turn to God, God will save them." Again: "If you are lost—if you die in your sin—whose fault is it? God has commanded you to repent and to seek salvation at once."—G. T., pp. 151, 268.

Mr. Moody, then, does teach repentance; but he compresses faith, salvation and repentance into a nut-shell, and gives but little margin for anything whatever.

It is instantaneous, like a flash of lightning from the clouds; and hence he says of Zaccheus, "He must have been converted getting down" the tree! "It was right in the air, between the branches and the ground."—G. T., p. 122.

And, then, Mr. Moody makes a little Scripture as he goes along; he says, "He (Christ) told Zaccheus

that that was the last time he should pass that way." And while on spurious Scripture I will quote another sample: "Paul says, 'Jacob will leave his ailments in the grave.'"—pp. 121, 435.

But to return: As little space as Mr. Moody finds for faith and salvation, he not only gets repentance in somewhere but also confession. I quote one passage: "Now, I say to you that confession is as important as faith. 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.'"—P. 180.

This is very good, but the difficulty is, that the confession comes not "unto," but after the salvation; for, according to Mr. Moody's theory, he is saved the "moment" he believes!

Having now advanced so far in my review of Mr. Moody's revival theology, I will hear him

ON BAPTISM.

"Nor will being baptized do you any good. Yet you hear people say, "Why, I have been baptized, and I was born again when I was baptized." They believe that because they are baptized into the church they are baptized into the kingdom of God. I tell you that is utterly impossible. You may be baptized into the visible church, and yet not be baptized into the Son of God. Baptism is all right in its place. God forbid that I should say anything against it. But if you put it in the place of regeneration—in the place of a new birth—it is a terrible mistake. You cannot be baptized into the kingdom of God. If I thought I could baptize men into the kingdom of God it would be a good deal better for me to do that than to preach. I should get a bucket of water and go up and down the streets, and save men that way. If they would not let me do it while they were awake, I would do it while they were asleep. I would do it any how.' 'Except you are born of the Spirit, ye cannot enter

into the kingdom of God.' What has a sacrament to do with that? What has baptism to do with being born again?"—G. T., p. 88.

I have quoted this long passage in order to do Mr. Moody ample justice. He does not speak reverently of baptism. He does not speak of it as one should speak of a divine ordinance. He begins by saying: "Nor will being baptized do you any good." And, having said this, he blunders on to the end. But can the reader help recalling all the good things he has said about the word of God and obedience? Has he not said time and again that "A thus saith the Lord is enough?" Has he not exhorted his hearers to "take God at His word?"

Hear him again: "If God tells us to do a thing we are to do it; if he tells us to believe a thing, we are to believe it; we are to have faith in God."—p. 174.

It is evident Mr. Moody has no just conception of the importance and design of baptism. He says "baptism is all right in its place," but fails to tell his hearers where its place is. He seems not to know what to do with it. It is an "elephant" on his hands! It will "do no good," but is "all right in its place." "God forbid that I should say any thing against it." He speaks of being "baptized into the church," "into the kingdom of God," "into the visible church," and "into the Son of God," and says to put it "in the place of regeneration" or "a new birth," would be "a terrible mistake." He says, men "cannot be baptized into the kingdom of God," and that if he thought he could do it, he would "get a bucket of water, and go up and down

the streets, and save men in that way." And that if they would not let him do it "while they were awake," he "would do it while they were asleep." He "would do it any how." And he asks, "what has baptism to do with being born again?" He says, "God forbid I should say any thing against it," and still takes care to say nothing in its favor, except that "it is all right in its place," leaving it to his hearers to find its place, for he does not pretend to know, or, if he does, he will not tell.

I have already directed attention to the great commission under which the Apostles acted, and I only refer to it now to make a few additional remarks. The commission as recorded by Mark, links faith, baptism and salvation together; as recorded by Luke it links repentance and remission of sins together; and as recorded by both Mark and Luke we have faith, repentance, baptism, and remission of sins, or salvation, linked together; and for all this we have "A thus saith the Lord." The commission is backed by "ALL AUTHORITY IN HEAVEN AND IN EARTH."

The Apostles preached under this authority, and practiced in harmony with the commission. And they rarely ever preached without speaking of baptism. Acts ii: 38, is an example of this, and "they that gladly received his word were baptized."

And when Philip preached Christ unto the people of Samaria, and "they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Acts viii: 12. What a marked contrast between Philip's preaching and its results, and the

preaching of Mr. Moody! And when Peter is sent for to Cæsarea to preach to Cornelius and his household, after they believed he "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts x: 48. How different Mr. Moody; he says "it will do you no good," and talks of taking a "bucket," yes, a "bucket of water," and baptizing people "asleep" or "awake." What a burlesque on a divine ordinance, and that, too, coming from one so full of the Holy Ghost he thought it would kill him! And yet he says, "what was necessary for the salvation of so good a man" as Cornelius, is "necessary for us all:" yes, even the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, for he adds: "Let us pray that we may receive the Spirit *as they did*"! pp. 495, 496. Again: Paul preached at Phillippi, and Lydia and her household are baptized; also the jailer and his household, at the hour of midnight. Such a scene as that, I fear, would greatly dampen Mr. Moody's zeal. He, judging from his teaching, would have told them, "Baptism will do you no good." True, "it is all right in its place," but wait until to-morrow; and let us pray that we may be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Acts xvi: 15, 33.

He preached at Corinth, "and many of the Corinthians *hearing, believed* and were *baptized*." Acts xviii: 8. Paul himself, after having been specially called an apostle to the Gentiles, did not hesitate to "be baptized and wash away his sins." Acts xxii: 16.

Again: Philip preached to the eunuch on the public highway from Jerusalem to Gaza, and the eunuch said, "see, here is water, what doth hinder

me to be baptized? And Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down *both* into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him"—and the eunuch "went on his way rejoicing." Acts viii: 36–39.

This is primitive and apostolic, and no contrary teaching is. In those days *believing penitents*, and no others, were baptized; and they were all "baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus or by his authority; they were "baptized *into* Christ, and put on Christ;" they were "baptized into His death, and raised up in the likness of His resurrection." They were "baptized for the remission of sins." So John the Baptist preached and baptized; so Christ commissioned His Apostles; and so the Apostles and Evangelists preached and baptized.

Baptism is not the "new birth," but only the completion of it. It is not "regeneration," but the laver or "washing *of* regeneration." And it is all this only to *penitent believers in Christ*; not to infants, unbelievers and idiots.

Baptism is not a sectarian or denominational ordinance. It is not "the door into *some* church," "visible" nor "invisible." Christianity has nothing denominational about it. Baptism is not the door into the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, nor Baptist church. In apostolic times people were not

"baptized into the fellowship of *some* church," but they were "baptized into Christ" "for the remission of sins."

Christ gave Himself for "the church, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Eph. v: 25, 26. Peter says, "baptism saves us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." I. Peter iii: 21. And Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, beautifully presents the divine process of salvation: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Heb. x: 22. They were christians, and had been the subjects of this process. They began with "true," honest "hearts;" they believed, had a "full assurance of faith;" their "hearts were sprinkled from an evil conscience" by the blood of Christ; and their "bodies washed with pure water." *They had all been baptized!*

Paul speaks of a "form" or *mould* of doctrine. Now, the gospel consists in *facts* to be *believed*, *commands* to be *obeyed*, and *promises* to be *enjoyed*. Facts cannot be obeyed, but *commands* can, and must be obeyed. Paul says to the Romans: "But God be thanked, that (though) ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you."

The "doctrine" is one thing, and its "form" or mould is another. The 15th chapter, 1st Corinthians, contains the doctrine, consisting in the *death, burial,* and *resurrection* of Christ. These are the facts of the Gospel which can be believed, but not obeyed.

Now, what is the "form" or *mould?* IT IS BAPTISM! In baptism we have represented the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Christ died, was buried, and rose again. We die to sin, are buried, and rise to a new life. We are "crucified with Christ," then "buried with Him by baptism into death," "wherein also we are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." Col. ii: 12. Rom. vi: 3, 4, 16.

Baptism, then, is not the doctrine, but the form or mould of it; and it fills all the demands of the case. And there is nothing else that can fill them. Immersion alone meets all the requirements of the doctrine. It is a perfect mould. But sprinkling and pouring are out of the question, as they do not represent a death, burial, and resurrection at all. The Romans had "obeyed from the heart this mould of doctrine," and were "then made free from sin," and "became the servants of righteousness."

We bury dead men, those who are dead *to*, not *in* sin. Then we raise them up from the symbolical grave to walk in newness of life. We are planted in the likeness of Christ's death, and raised in the likeness of His resurrection.

CONCLUSION.

I have a few things to add in conclusion.

Mr. Moody says, "When a church is divided, no matter what the cause, the Spirit of God will not work there." But is it not strange that, while the Spirit of God will not work with a local church when divided, he will work with the divided and warring sects of Christendom? And may not the true explanation of this be, that men often mistake the spirit of the party or sect for the Spirit of Christ? And is it not well to "try the spirits, whether they are of God?"

Mr. Moody, in some respects, seems to ignore denominational distinctions. Hear him:

"So can every one be saved, no matter what church he belongs to—whether he belongs to the true Apostolic Church, or to any other Church. The Son of God can serve in any Church, or in any denomination." G. T., p. 111. "The Son of God will be in the right Church; He makes no mistake." Again: "We have not heard a word about denominations since I have been here." P. 445.

Yes; but what becomes of all of Mr. Moody's unbaptized converts? Do they scatter like sheep on the mountains, or are they gathered into some sectarian fold? But let us hear him once more:

"The moment he hears the word of God taught, *he comes out of the sectarian world*, and is interested to have the cause of God advanced in all parts of the world." G. T., p. 439.

But are sectarianism and denominationalism broken down where Mr. M.'s evangelical labors have been most abundant? When the excitement and enthusiasm inspired by the presence of Moody and Sankey have passed away, do not the same sects and denominations remain as proud, exclusive, and defiant as ever? And, as Mr. Moody belongs to a Sect, does he not trim his way somewhat, in order that he may not offend the churches where he labors? And, particularly, does he not practically, if not in theory, ignore a Divine ordinance so as not to offend? Would not his insisting on obedience to this heaven-appointed ordinance, dampen the zeal of his co-laborers, and "quench the spirit" that animates them? Would not the cry, "See, here is water," put out the fire?

And yet, Mr. Moody says:

"The first thing that God wants is obedience." "To obey is better than sacrifice." A blessing is promised to all that obey." "And God always keeps every promise He makes, and I defy any infidel to show any promise He has not kept." "He has been true to His word for 6000 years."

And, I ask, will he not be true to this word: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved?"

I close with the words of Paul: "Now to him that is of power to establish you according to *my gospel*, and *the preaching of Jesus Christ*, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according *to the commandment of the everlasting God*, MADE KNOWN TO ALL NATIONS FOR THE OBEDIENCE OF FAITH; to God only wise be glory through Jesus Christ forever. Amen." Rom. xvi: 25–27.

Supplemental Chapter.

Being an Inquiry Into the Reasons Underlying Mr. Moody's Marvellous Success as an Evangelist.

—BY—

JOSEPH H. FOY,

Pastor Central Christian Church, Saint Louis, Mo.

The primary purpose of the gospel is to release the soul from the guilt, power and punishment of sin—to *save men* already under condemnation through wicked works, and not to civilize or moralize them. It cannot be denied that the gospel exerts a most wholesome influence upon the manners and morals of those who even partially receive it, nor can it be questioned that it tends from various causes to increase the intellectual robustness of those who heartily embrace it. These salutary effects are beneficent *secondary* results of the blessed gospel, which is the "power of God unto *salvation*." Jesus Christ came to seek and to save the *lost*. He came not merely as a teacher empowered by superior virtue and wisdom to speak with a tone of authority—nor did He appear in the world's extremity to inject

fresh blood into its rotting carcass and to drop seed truths that should stamp Him as the great reformer merely, of all the ages. Whatever theories may have been agitated in the past as to the causes requiring the death of the August One on the cross, the minds and hearts of men are gradually, but firmly settling down upon the conviction that He was no mere *martyr* to truth, the victim of popular resentment against one who had disturbed the apathy of the public mind by the introduction of new and unwelcome sentiments. A profounder principle required His death than the sealing of His testimony by sufferings that should prove His sincerity, be an example to all coming generations, and touch the sensibilities of the race through all time. No theory of govermental necessity, or of satisfaction offered to the ethical nature of God, meets every phase of the question. Man was *lost* and Jesus came to *save* him. Moved by deepest love and most generous sympathies, He hung upon the cross for us, and His great heart burst with the weight of a world's woe upon it. He was under no obligations to shoulder the burden or to become a victim, but the resistless tide of His measureless and unfathomable love swept away every obstruction and burst upon the world in streams that have gladdened, strenghtened and enriched the minds and hearts of all who, in succeeding ages, have looked upon the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. Every now and then the church seems to lose sight of Jesus as the expiation, the atonement, the "only name given under heaven whereby we can be saved," and with this temporary

obscuration of perception come slight views of sin and its danger, and a decided abatement of the ardor of that love which would naturally be enkindled by a vivid conception of Jesus as a deliverer, a rescuer, a Savior. If Christianity be but a system of superior morality, and Jesus' only claim to admiration and homage, consist solely in the elevation of His maxims, then indeed would many despairing hearts re-echo the mournful cry of the woman at the sepulchre, "They have taken away the *body* of my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." Christianity is robbed of its power over the hearts and consciences of men by any theory that takes away the *blood of Christ.* Infidels and supple pulpit charlatans may sneer at the sacrificial element in Christianity,—but eliminate it and you have drawn its life-blood, sucked out all its vigor, and left a poor nerveless, emasculated shadow, that cannot long retain the devotion of mankind. When the church ceases to use the gospel as a life-boat, thrust out by sturdy arms and brave hearts into the raging deep to rescue men and women that are *perishing*, it renounces its strongest claim to the veneration and love of man. Platitudes about the gospel as a means of cultivating, softening, humanizing and refining, may amuse a leisure hour, but have no power to quicken sluggish souls, to soothe anguished spirits, to arch the tomb with a bow of hope, to sustain earth's suffering, toiling, disappointed millions in the midst of life's stern realities, or to comfort the afflicted in their weary march along a thorny way to the mournful tap of sorrow's funeral drum. When

men's consciences have been cloyed with vapid and insipid sweets that have no power to alarm, vitalize or regenerate, up rises some rude but stalwart and dogmatic reformer whose vivid conception of man's perilous condition, of Jesus as a present Savior, offering an amnesty on certain conditions to a rebellious race, gives to his curt directness of appeal a weight with men not warranted, it may be, by scholarly culture. Of late years, in particular, the pulpit has resounded with sky-scraping, glittering generalities, uttered by silken men who "minced damnation with a phrase." Men's consciences have been soothed by pulpit sirups and lulled by madrigals. Sin has been but a slight disharmony, and the terrors of a rejected gospel but the roll of drums and mimic thunders of the stage. Worldlings whose fears were not entirely throttled by lives of careless indulgence, clamored for a "gospel of love," meaning by the phrase such a proclamation of the word as should not awaken fears of retribution in the beyond. Universalism and restorationism have made immense inroads into various religious bodies and a sentimental and wishy-washy religiosity has largely taken the place of an unaffected piety. The wonderful achievements and grand possibilities of human nature were so lavishly lauded by pulpit orators, that people began to look upon the gospel simply as *one* of the instruments used by the Almighty to uplift the race and not as "*the* power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Indeed many religious leaders asserted or insinuated that Christianity was but the development or embodiment of

progressive religious thought, and that having served the purpose of God, it would expire by a statute of limitation, and give place to a new dispensation better adapted to an advanced and enlightened age—too refined indeed, to be frightened by the Devil or awed by allusions to undying worms or unquenchable fires. Amidst all this religious defibrination and soft play of summer lightnings from popular pulpits, a "rough and hairy man" surcharged with the electric force of an earnestness that makes him deliver his whole force at every blow, has stalked into the arena and struck the shield of his foe with no knightly bow of hollow grace, but with a clang that betokens mortal and unappeasable hate. And the masses have been thrilled and minds and hearts tired of smooth prophesyings and dulcet vaticinations of

> "One far-off divine event
> To which the whole creation moves,"

have been mightily stirred by a man untrained in the costly graces of the schools, but deeply conscious of ruin and the remedy.

Much good has undoubtedly been accomplished by Mr. Moody, because he has not hesitated to strike boldly at sin—to paint its hideousness—to denounce its sovereignty as the rule of death, and to call attention to Jesus as the life, the truth, and the way. People have instinctively felt that he was acting no mimetic part, but that he was terribly in earnest. Before him are immortal souls—above him the brandished sword of justice ready to fall,—underneath, the brazen vaults of hell ready to receive those who refuse his authorized invitations to enter upon immor-

tal joys. No wonder his deadly earnestness should affect his audiences and communicate a new impulse to the stagnant religionism of the age. And yet we think that Dr. Walsh has proven beyond a reasonable doubt in the foregoing chapters, that this Moody and Sankey evangel, is, after all, a mutilated and fragmentary gospel. Nevertheless, to our mind, he is far in advance of most of the popular religious parties of the day. Perhaps it may be the design of the Providence that often overrules the designs of bad men as well as the mistakes of good men, that his preaching may bridge or help to bridge the chasm between the simplicity of the primitive gospel and its modern mystical perversions. For example, Mr. Moody is clear and striking in his preference of the evidence afforded by God's word as to regeneration, over that drawn from physical sensations merely. Nervous exacerbations or psychological phenomena constituted at no remote period in the past, especially in these bodies that yet arrogantly assume to be exclusively evangelical, the christian's ground of trust that God had remitted sins and received a penitent into favor. Within the memory of men still living, the promulgation of the doctrine that there are Bible conditions or New Testament methods of appropriating the salvation provided by the death of Christ, was hooted at almost universally as a vain trust in a "dead letter," and as an attempt to obtain pardon through lifeless, inoperative works. It is a hopeful indication of progress that Mr. Moody can promulge this wholesome truth to a certain extent, at least, even in the presence of straight-

laced divines of Calvinistic schools. And this movement "towards Jerusalem" renders Mr. Moody's ministration much less open to rational impugnment than the wild vagaries and senseless ravings of the fanatical Hammond. Still Mr. Moody is either in ignorance of the "full orbed" gospel, or else he deems himself justified in suppressing for the present a part of the truth, in order to secure the efficient and zealous co-operation of those denominations that would promptly turn upon him if he should assail too radically their cherished tenets. We dislike to intimate even the possibility of such politic action in one who has much of the lion in his composition, and possesses many of those qualifications that stamp one as a leader of men. But many of his published utterances are in such happy accord with the principles of the reformatory movement represented in the religious world by the Disciples of Christ, that we can with difficulty believe that he stops short of a full knowledge of the truth. He may think, I would suggest, that as faith in Jesus is the root of the Christian religion, and as neither preachers nor people after so long groping in the murky atmosphere of creed-dom are "able to bear" a sudden translation from the metaphysics of modern divinity to the translucent simplicity of the ancient method of conversion, that he is justified in proclaiming a partial and scrappy gospel, which is, however, infinitely superior in point of intelligibility and rationality to the doctrines of evangelical (?) schools. Mr. Moody must be aware, we would again suggest, that any movement of a religious

character that wishes to secure the coöperation of the "orthodox" bodies, must refrain from any direct attack upon their prejudices, principles and polities. Mr. Moody, therefore, from a selfish standpoint evinces generalship of no mean order, in being able to keep for so long a time the sectarian devil asleep, or if not sound asleep, from using its terrific teeth and cruel claws upon the chief operator and director of modern "orthodox" evangelization. Without doubt, we must conclude, knowing from sad experience the suspiciousness and inveterate animosity of the *odium theologicum* that Mr. Moody has been compelled to move very gingerly and deftly. He therefore steers clear of all embarrassing complications, and while using just enough mysticism to propitiate and disarm the clergy for whose collaboration he is solicitious, he goes boldly many steps in advance of their evangelical (?) sentiments! If you should doubt this, we shall ask you to contrast Mr. Moody's teachings as quoted by the learned Walsh with the standard authorities and revered preachers of the very sects that most enthusiastically endorse the Moody movement. I will make a few citations, and ask your thoughtful attention to them, and their utter irreconcilableness with much of the Moody theology.

In the first place he does not regard the Word of God as "an assemblage of *dead* types," but admits that it is "quick" (alive) and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, · · · and is a *discerner of the thoughts, and intents of the heart.*" In the next place he more than once intimates that *faith is the belief*

of a proposition sustained by evidence, rather than an infusion or divine coërcion or "grace imparted to a passive soul incapable of excitement by motives."

And while in other instances his mind is clouded and he appears to refer the exercise of faith to Omnipotent power, he yet clearly teaches that such faith is available to every one *without exception* who seeks it. Many of Mr. Moody's clerical backers teach that faith is the gift of God, not as our bread and clothes are the gifts of God, but in the sense that it is a supernatural and extra scriptural impartation. They teach, if language can convey an idea, *that it cannot be acquired by the exercise of our intellectual or moral power*, and, consequently, that an unbeliever will not be condemned for lack of faith, but for Adam's sin in its direful effects upon all posterity. They teach that faith comes directly from heaven and is an entity or substance thrust directly into the mind by the Holy Spirit which makes the man anew in the twinkling of an eye and gives him "another reason and another will." This quoted clause is from Martin Luther's sermon on "The Method and Fruits of Justification." The Calvinistic portion of Mr. Moody's clerical backers believe with Dr. Breckinridge (*vide* "Knowledge of God," Vol. II., pp. 156, 157), that "the work of Divine renovation is a sovereign act of the Creator, wherein those sinful persons of the human race, who will inherit eternal life [the elect] are renewed in the image of God," and that as we have been created anew in Christ Jesus, *therefore* saving faith mani-

fests itself in us." The Methodistic part of his co-laborers unhesitatingly reëcho the declaration of Dr. Olin that "the great proofs *on which the gospel relies* are demonstrations made to the moral perceptions of man, and are altogether independent of logic," of persuasive appeals, or even of Sankey singing." "Even," continues this able Methodist divine, "the *preliminary* evidences and influences of the gospel are of this sort." A man cannot make the faintest beginning, the slightest forward movement in the matter of salvation unaided by influences which are in every sense apart from the word, apart from his fellow-men, apart from himself. "The *true* light," he continues, "shines into all hearts," not through the Bible, nor even through the example and instructions of good men illumined by the Spirit, but "*directly* from God." See his discourse on "*Faith in Christ the Great Want of the Soul.*" That Mr. Moody does not swallow *all* this stale and vapid nonsense is evident from the citations made by Bro. Walsh, but that his perceptions are clear, and that he is completely out of the smoke of Babylon cannot be claimed by any one after reading the Doctor's masterly essay. Still his condition of mind is hopeful and we regard his sermons as pioneer drops through the sectarian dam that will eventually lead off stagnant waters to the great ocean of truth that tosses its white arms in the rapture of freedom. We do not believe that Mr. Moody's "preaching support" approve all his utterances; indeed, a keen observer can see a faint stir at times in the sleeping camp, but as they hope to

reap the benefits of his popularity in a substantial numerical and pecuniary increment, they "gulp" down the rising anathema and extend a seemingly cordial endorsement to their indefatigable brother. Mr. Moody's evident lack of careful theological training, his frequent deferential references to their superior learning, his avowed want of acquaintance with the original languages of the sacred records—nay, his very solecisms of speech, and, above all, his point-blank refusal to be considered a "reverend," but only a lay-talker:—all these things are in his favor, and prevent the up-springing of jealous rivalry.

Another element of power is his careful manipulation of his ministerial help. He calls upon the pastors of the wealthy and powerful churches of the community to take such conspicuous action in the introductory exercises, or in the overflow meetings or enquiry-room operations, as either commits them to the movement with zealous advocacy, or shuts the mouth firmly to invidious criticism. The question may be asked, If Moody's success is attributable to the various causes you have recounted, prominently among them being that of a fuller but still defective presentation of the Primitive Gospel, why should not able and earnest men who discard all creeds of human devisement, and who give apostolical answers to inquiring penitents, and who preach the old faith without adulteration, addition or subtraction,—why should not these proclaimers have an equal measure of success with Moody? Principally because in the present untaught and preju-

diced condition of the public religious mind, the result of ages of training in the metaphysics of Augustinian divinity, the immediate restoration of the ancient order of things is too radical, revolutionary and overwhelmingly subversive not to arouse a tide of prejudice, bigotry and opposition that cannot be successfully stemmed. There is not a particle of doubt that Knowles Shaw had every element of a great Evangelist to an extent and richness that cannot be claimed for Moody by his most enthusiastic admirer. Indeed Shaw was Moody and Sankey both. And yet he created scarce a tithe of the excitement and stir in the religious world effected by Moody and his singing partner.

We do not underrate Mr. Moody's natural gifts, they are more than mediocre—they are *very* respectable. He has a grand use of the sturdy Saxon stock of our noble tongue, and can use it as graphically as Bunyan, the heavenly dreamer, or Defoe, of Crusoe and Friday memory.

Another source of Moody's power is this: Although the Bible is to him without system, and all Dispensations the same—insomuch that we verily believe he would as lief go to the Proverbs of Solomon or to Genesis for directions how to enter Christ or to reclaim a back-slider as to the four "gospels" or to the epistles of the New Testament—yet it cannot be denied that he evinces extraordinary familiarity with the sacred oracles in this hodge-podge way. He is a man of one book emphatically, and therefore equipped and formidable. Well, says some caviller, are not all educated ministers thor-

oughly informed in the scriptures? We hate to dissipate so pleasant a delusion, but to the best of our knowledge and belief, we have encountered several D.D.'s who knew almost everything else better than the Bible! And we are thoroughly convinced that the National Sunday-school lessons have been the means of giving the average minister throughout the country a better knowledge of the Bible than his entire seminary training and his pulpit career afterwards. Ministers were everywhere busy reading and studying *about* the Bible instead of going at once to the fountain-head. To teach their Bible-classes and superintend their Sunday-schools or answer questions likely to be propounded by their flocks, they have been forced to go of late years to the great source of spiritual enlightenment and power. This Mr. Moody has always done. The Bible is to him a great reality—it is *the* book, the *only* book from which to learn religion or ascertain the will of God. This reverence for it and this ready reference to it as the arbiter of doubts and the resolver of difficulties, even though many of his interpretations may be exceedingly lame, together with his rare facility in apt illustration bearing upon the sympathies and necessities of his hearers, give him wonderful power with the masses of men *over whose humble heads*, as a general thing, the critical and polished products of the seminaries had been firing their ineffectual volleys for "lo, these many years." A sermon had become a popular synonym for learned dulness. All living questions were relegated to the fireside, the forum or the press—but all devitalized abstractions

were deemed suitable to the pulpit. If a minister could be understood, it was self-evident that he had mistaken his calling, and was making use of a perspicacious "carnal mind" in solemn investigations. Indeed he was at once suspected of profaneness, and requested by the pillars and sleepers of the dunciad to examine himself, in order to ascertain the ground of a confidence placed in such imminent jeopardy by fleshly perspicuity!

Thank God *that* day is past! Men are now striving in their pulpit ministrations *to be understood.* And Mr. Moody has contributed wonderfully to this beneficent revolution. You cannot mistake his meaning whether you agree with him or not. His sermons may, in some particulars, occasionally clash, but you will carry off the idea that is uppermost in his mind at the time. We do not hesitate to affirm, that if Mr. Moody's career does nothing more than open the eyes of the preachers to the fact, that simple, homely speech, abundantly illustrated, will accomplish more than fine-spun rhetoric or ponderous logic, it will not have been in vain.

As Dr. Walsh has shown, Mr. Moody sometimes inveighs against "dead creeds," but with "evangelical" cunning, he is careful not to call names, leaving it to the Methodist brother, *in his heart*, to apply the remark to the Presbyterians and Congregationalists or Baptists, while each of these parties is not backward in making a different application of so *general* and diffuse a denunciation. Mr. Moody never attacks those denominations that are securely entrenched in popular regard, and fortified within

palatial churches and splendid colleges. He recognizes the fact that he holds public attention and sympathy largely through their tolerance and encouragement, and hence, when he has any bottles of wrath to uncork, that he may play the role of a virtuous censor in the religious world, he slurs the tenets of some comparatively poor and weak Denomination, whose opposition may not be able to diminish the rising tide of his influence. If he were *once* openly and boldly to declare, as Dean Stanley has lately said, that immersion is the primitive action of baptism; if he were publicly to declare what he knows full well that there is no Scripture warrant for the baptism of unconscious babes; if he were to point out the evils of creeds as bonds of union and communion; if he were to direct attention to the inconsistency of the Protestant world to their fundamental principle, "the Bible, and the Bible *alone* the religion of Protestants;" if he were to direct the attention of his audience to the fact that baptism in ancient times occupied the position now claimed by the "mourners' bench" or "anxious seat," a position admitted by the greatest lights in the Evangelical (?) fold; if he were to assert what has been admitted time and time again by the greatest names in the ranks of Protestantism that in the Early Church the Christians met every Lord's-day primarily to break the emblematic loaf; if he were to lift up an eloquent voice in favor of genuine Christian union, not upon some skim-milk sentimental basis, but upon the clear-cut teachings of the Divine Word—why, in less than a week, Mr. Moody's clerical body-

guard would collapse like Prof. Wise's balloon, and none of those so unctuously and ostentatiously deferential to him now, would be "so poor as to do him reverence." Indeed, in a month's time, he would find himself scarcely able to stir a ripple in a village, much less to set cities and continents ablaze. Now and then with gospel guile and evangelical craftines (?) he throws, like Eneas of old, a soporific honey-cake to the watchful Cerberus of sect, whose teeth begin to shine menacingly between parting lips, and whose subdued growls show that danger is near, when in the ardor of his appeals to those who are hanging back waiting for electric thrills from the skies, to let them know that *their* debt is paid, he talks too freely that heretical doctrine, that "faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God." He hastens to placate the incipient tempest, by sneering at baptism as a work of law, and declaring his readiness to go forth as a savior, if "Baptism as a condition of the remission of sins" be true, armed with a wooden water-bucket and, we suppose, a broom to scatter the "regenerating fluid." Nay more, he is willing, without doubt, to "run down" the refractory and the recalcitrant who will not be "baptized" by the agency of the aforesaid bucket and broom, and "baptize" them "nolus bolus," as a colored minister once said. Nay, such is the frantic nature of his zeal, if "baptism be anything at all," that he will lie in wait for the unwary, and when slumber softly seals the vigilant eye and locks the attentive ear, he will steal to the side of his unsuspecting "victim" and "baptize" him whether or no! Shade of Ignatias Lloyola and his mighty squirt-gun! Upon what meat hath

Cæsar Moody fed that he is able to project such mighty and valorous feats!

Let him patiently and reverently consult the following *pertinent* passages, and he may possibly regret his irrelevant and *impertinent* twaddle upon a subject with which he is evidently, however great his knowledge of the book in many other respects, utterly ignorant. Matt. 28: 18–20; Mark 16: 16; John 3: 5; Acts 2: 38; Acts 8: 12; Titus 3: 5; Rom. 6: 3, 4, 5; Col. 2: 12, 13; Rom. 6: 18; Gal. 2: 26, 27; Rom. 7: 4; Eph. 2: 11–193. It is appropriate just here to inquire briefly into the reason for the tardiness exhibited by people now-a-days in "obeying the truth." Why do not multitudes inquire as they did at Pentecost, "What must we do?" and hasten at once *to do* the things commanded and rejoice immediately in hope of the glory of God? Because modern preaching is, in general, utterly unlike that employed in the early days of the Church, and because it has been sedulously and catechetically drilled into men through centuries in which mysticism held full sway that one cannot receive God's truth through natural channels as he receives other truth, but that he must "meet Jesus" or "find Jesus" in some mysterious, inexplicable and unintelligible way—the evidence of said "finding" being, usually, the instantaneous rolling off of a huge burden of oppressive "convictions," and the inflashing of a marvelous illumination, followed by the lightning-like extrication of the "subject" from the slough of a fearful despondency in which each and every one thus operated upon was impressed with the firm and indubitable conviction,

(wrought, it is assumed, by the Spirit of all truth) that he was, beyond all peradventure, the wickedest man that ever lived or ever would live, the annihilation of evil appetites and passions killed at one stroke, root and branch, and the immediate realization of peace and spiritual power beyond expression.

Mr. Moody, then, by the skilful avoidance of attack upon sectarian shibboleths and by playing into the hands of the ruling Denominations secures either their active advocacy *for* or their passive acquiescence *in* his methods. The approbatory presence and participation of the shepherds secure the attendance and moral support of the flocks, of the religious papers, and largely of the secular press.

Many ministers who disapprobate Mr. Moody's caterings to popular prejudices and errors, see that he is nevertheless far in advance of the creed-mongers and tradition-worshippers of the times, and, for the sake of the improvement, however slight, refrain from all determined opposition and watch the outcome of the movement with hope. If the result shall be that even in the far future men shall break away from the chilling restraints of Calvinism—from the senseless mummery of baptismal regeneration, or from the lawless latitudinarianism of Universalism and return in a measure to the faith once delivered to the saints, they will realize that their patience has wrought its perfect work. We may as well just here, summarize that simple but perfect scriptural teaching: (a) "The Bible accepted as an *all sufficient rule of faith* and practice; (b) Christ the Savior of the world—at once prophet, Priest, King, Mediator,

Judge; (c) Salvation *found in obedience* to the law and authority of Christ, and *not* in obedience to the law of Moses or to the law of councils or to the decretals of Popes; (d) The authority of Christ and the *conditions of salvation* found in the Apostolical Commission; (e) Sinners come to Christ or "find Jesus" or "meet Jesus" through knowledge of the truth and through the "obedience of faith" as invariably and explicitly proclaimed by the apostles and evangelists of the New Testament; (f) All who approach Christ—whoever 'has heard and has learned of the Father'—approach him as the Great Mediator between God and man; (g) They confess their sins, and openly avow their sincere faith in Christ as the Son of God; (h) As an evidence of their faith in Jesus the Christ they *at once* joyfully submit to be "buried with Christ in baptism," an act of supreme obedience which at once inducts them into the kingdom of God, and therefore into a state of justification (John 3: 5; Gal. 3: 27); (i) The promise of God to all such is, that they shall receive the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2: 38 and 3: 19), who shall, if they do not "quench" Him "abide with them forever;" (j) They are "adopted" into the family of God, and become "partakers of the divine *nature*," not instantly or miraculously but gradually and in perfect harmony with the laws of mind, after having been "begotten by the word of truth" (I. Pet. 1: 23), and "made alive to God" the Father through birth from the baptismal grave (Rom. 6: 3, 4; Col. 2: 12, 13; Col. 3: 1); (k) As such, it is necessary to unite with a congregation of Christians, with the view of keeping the ordinances of the church,

reading the word of the Lord, prayer, the weekly observance of the Lord's supper, contributing for the poor saints "having fruit with holiness, and the end eternal life."

One source of Moody's power is the companionship and collaboration of Sankey, who is a "sweet soloist, and in tripping measures tickles the sensibilities of the pious public, and deftly sets the mysteries and solemnities of religion to a chirrup." There is a deal of the emotional and the sentimental in his singing, and he loads current piety with much sweetish nonsense, but then it *draws*, and, therefore, in the view of modern revivalism, *pays*. In the ages to come, when pious musical antiquaries of reverential turn of mind shall delve into the hymnic records of the past, great will be their astonishment to unearth such warlike ditties as "Hold the Fort, for I am Coming," and to learn from the chronicles of a remote era that thousands professed to "find Jesus," or to have their lapsed peace renewed while bawling that belligerent melody.

After all, the greatest secret of the wonderful power brought into modern revivalism by Mr. Moody, is the positive iteration and reiteration by him that there need be no uncertainty in the matter of salvation from sin—that rest, security, safety may be realized *in every case*, and that *immediately*. The long and dubious seekings of former evangelizing movements are discarded, and inquirers are instructed that the moment they are conscious of faith in Christ, they need go no further in frantic efforts "to do some great thing," or obtain some testimonial of an impres-

sive extra-scriptural nature. "You are, *then*," says Mr. Moody, "in a saved state *at once*"—the "*Book says so*, and its testimony is infinitely superior to your variable animal feelings" or exacerbated mental states. This is a great advance upon the old plan, which was to work up excitement studiously and artfully, with every appliance of ecclesiastical and evangelical (?) ingenuity, until nature, in order to preserve both mind and body, came to the rescue with a healthful reaction to the tensely-drawn nervous systems and preternaturally excited imaginations of weak and unfortunate auditors. This *letting down* of long-continued and destructive excitement was universally hailed by a bigoted and benighted orthodox clergy as a direct response to prayer, and a regenerative movement of God's spirit upon that of the blind and fanatical devotee.

Another source of Moody's power is the wiping out of sect divisions and partitions for the time being. True, they are not annihilated, but kept from prudential reasons in rigid abeyance, yet the effect upon the multitudes who flock to hear Moody, of a spirit of brotherly coöperation and concord and *apparent* fraternity is good, and the results flattering. Oh, what would be the blessed consequences to the world of the utter demolition and expungement of carnalizing divisions and the presentation to a sinful, dying race of a United Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but grand in the simple majesty of truth, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," all its individual members, in such important matters as the

means of laying hold of the blood of the Just One, speaking the same things and joined together in the same judgments! Few are so hardened or so infatuated at this late day as to contend for sectism with its infernal jealousies and despiritualizing rivalries, on the ground of wholesome competitive heat and salutary emulative fire! And the distinction between the oppressive oneness of Mediæval Romanism, wrought by finesse, force, fear and fagot in an age of dense darkness, and a oneness brought about by loyalty to truth, and voluntarily sought and accepted by free spirits and loving, longing hearts, is recognized by all minds save those so saturated and obfuscated by narrow bigotry and proscriptive intolerance as to be entirely beyond the reach of enlightenment. I, therefore, give Mr. Moody all praise and honor to the extent of his departure from the doctrines of the mystics, but I compassionate his adherence even yet to certain features of their theology, from which the religious world will be compelled to break away before substantial progress and a universal dissemination and domination of Christian principles can be safely counted on. Nay, through ignorance, or the inveteracy of prejudices; or a *misapplication* of the Pauline doctrine of "becoming all things to all men" he twists, warps, and even wilfully suppresses portions of Divine Truth because their enunciation would flatly contradict and destroy the symmetry of his partial and imperfect system. If he ever quotes in his enquiry meetings such passages of Scripture as Mark xvi: 16, or Acts ii: 38, or Acts iii: 19, or John iii: 3, or Rom. vi: 3, 4, or Acts xxii: 16, or Gal. iii: 27, or

Titus iii: 5, or I. Pet. iii: 21, or a host of passages to which the writer cannot for lack of space refer, we do not know it. Nor do the frequent, solemn and respectful allusions of Holy Writ to Baptism as a part of the Gospel, and not as an ordinance within the Church awaken any notice save a flippant, sarcastic or contemptous one. Even if it were, which is by no means admitted, one of the *least* commandments of our Savior and not the initiatory rite of the New Dispensation; the ceremony of enlistment in the army of the cross, the "sacramental host of God's elect;"—the method of induction into the church of the living God, the ground and pillar of the truth;—the impressive espousal of the wooed and won sinner to the Head of the church;—he that alludes to it contemptuously and teaches men to neglect it, though he be in many respects, seemingly, a great and good man, will be "called least in the Kingdom of Heaven." I would have Mr. Moody to remember that as Abraham desired to *know* that God's verbal promise to him would be assuredly kept, and the same was, in consequence, formally ratified by the blazing lamp passing between the divided parts of the sacrificial offering—God thus meeting him, and, as it were, reassuring him, and bolstering, in tender mercy, his weak and tottering faith by a mutual covenant and a visible, striking pledge,—so baptism is an act in which the interior or psychical states are translated into open speech, *or brought out of doors*, the whole man in mind, heart and body, participating in an "act of faith," to which memory will ever recur in coming years as a grand moment of entire conse-

cration, when the weak human subject received, as it were, a token, or pledge, or handshake of plighted troth and unswerving fidelity from the other Party to the great and blessed compact. I have used the term "mysticism," more than once in the course of this article. Lest the reader might not gather from the connection the full sense in which I employ it, I will close with a condensed statement of that system so far as its vague and shadow tenets can be formulated in human speech.

For a further and more complete knowledge of the system we would refer the reader to the "Organon of Scripture" by J. S. Lamar, a work worthy of a place in every library in Christendom. I would also invite attention to a scholarly article in the *Christian Quarterly* of April, 1872. Without further ado we place before the reader the leading features of the conflicting systems, asking that he will glance at one and then the other, that his faith may not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God:

"MYSTICISM"

Is the doctrine of direct or immediate spiritual influence; assuming that man by birth, nature, and habit is *totally depraved*, so depraved that he is utterly unable to use any intellectual or moral power for his conversion, until God enables him to do so by direct influence, and this direct influence results in *Regeneration*. The mind being thus illuminated, the moral sensibilities being aroused, and the will impelled, man exercises faith in God and Christ, believes the truth to the saving of his soul.

Mysticism declares that man is passive, and publishes to the world that passivity is orthodoxy, activity is heterodoxy—that "doing is a deadly thing."

It conceives that the grace of God is a mystic, divine influence moving upon the spirit of man, and exciting him to action; that *just as* God breathed upon the automatic Adam in Eden, and the lifeless red earth became a living soul, *so* God breathes upon the automatic sinner, and he becomes a living soul in Christ, and then believes in the Son of God.

"INTELLECTUALISM, BIBLICISM OR APOSTOLICISM"

Is the doctrine of mediate, spiritual influences; contending that man, by birth and nature, is not *totally* depraved, but may *become so* by habit. It defends the apostolic thesis, "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

It humbly acknowledges its inability *to devise* a plan of salvation, but rejoices in the moral ability possessed by the mind *to accept* the plan of Christ. It sits with Mary at the Master's feet, and learns wisdom from his lips. It communes with Peter as he discourses to the Jews on Pentecost; with Paul as he reasons concerning the Christ at Thessalonica. It will not consent to be passive, but thinks, feels, and wills as God, *by His spirit in the Apostles,* gives direction. It conceives that the grace of God has appeared unto all men in the proclamation of the gospel; *that the gospel is* THE *grace* of God, and the power of God unto salvation to all who receive with meekness the engrafted word.

It is, in fine, reason not proudly or arrogantly discarding the help of revelation, and questioning the winds, the stars or the rocks, but reason *hearing* God speak, reason *believing* the things spoken of God, reason invoking the affections to so love God as to prefer His service to the dominion of bestial lusts and propensities, reason invoking, provoking, determining and strengthing the feeble will to obey with fidelity Him whose lawful, indefeasible right it is to reign in and over us the creatures of His hands." Read carefully Bro. Walsh's book, and may it be a means used of God to combat hydra-headed error and to lead blinded and befogged men to a clearer knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, to whom be praise, world without end, Amen.

Encyclopedia

—ON THE—

EVIDENCES,

OR,

Masterpieces of Many Minds

By J. W. MONSER.

IN COURSE OF PREPARATION.

The author of this book has felt for many years past, that such a work is sorely needed. There are only a few private libraries that are so well stocked with choice authorities, as to enable the owners to range at will through the vast and multitudious lines of argumentation offered upon matters pertaining to God, Man and Destiny. Nor does time allow this liberty unto any but the devoted scholar. And yet it is by this course only that the harmonies of evidence are manifested, the strength of the Christian apologetics set forth, and the faith of the believer universally confirmed. The streams of truth flowing in from a thousand sources, fill up the joyous well of his salvation.

Impressed with this fact, by a personal experience, which has been both a health and a delight, the writer has spared no pains to secure everything which could assist him in his laborious undertaking. The publisher, therefore, takes pleasure in offering to the public an "Encyclopedia on the Evidences," in which the following themes are amply treated, to-wit: "God," "Creation,"

"Design," "Science and Religion," "Miracles," "Providence," "Moral Evil," "Man," "The Bible," "Infidelity," "Christ and Christianity," "Immortality and the Resurrection," "Retribution."

These chapters are made up of the very best things that the literary, the scientific, the rationalistic and the religious have said, in anywise favorable to truth, and contains the choicest paragraphs and sections possible, of affirmation, criticism, exegeses, and eulogy. Nor are the authors cut off in the midst of a good thing. Some quotations extend over ten or even fifteen pages: some over but two, three, five: some but over a page, or half a page—depending entirely on the merit or need of the thought treated. Almost every favorite idea and argument that has been ringing in the ears of generations of men, will be found here, besides the very latest utterances, from the French, German, English and American schools of thought.

We intend this book to comprehend, at a glance, all that is needed; and that from the established authorities of the world. It is prepared to subdue Infidels, heal doubters, convert sinners, and strengthen the hands and hearts of saints. It enters the field, so far as we know, without a rival, and we invoke God's benison upon it.

It is expected to reach from 600 to 700 pages, and will be handsomely bound in Cloth, Library, and Turkey Morocco, Full Gilt.

AGENTS WANTED.

JOHN BURNS, PUBLISHER,
ST. LOUIS, MO.

JUST OUT.

A HAND-BOOK

—OF—

Christian Evidence.

By LAURENCE W. SCOTT.

WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT IT:

A HAND BOOK OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE. By Laurence W. Scott. In two parts. St. Louis, John Burns, Publisher, 1880. 12mo. pp. 310. Price $1.50.

Bro. Scott has given his time and his heart to this subject for many years, and has had an opportunity to test his positions and arguments in numerous debates with unbelievers. He has succeeded in presenting the standard evidences of Christianity in a condensed form, yet with clearness and freshness; and has added to this a good deal that relates to some of the more modern phases of infidelity. Spiritism comes in for a severe handling. It is a very readable book, contains much valuable historical matter, and has the advantage of presenting all this in small space, so that ordinary readers will not be repulsed by the size of the book or tediousness of the argument, In these days of doubt, the more people can be persuaded to read such books the better. We hope it will have a large sale.

The publisher deserves honorable mention for the neatness and taste displayed in the arrangement and mechanical execution of the work.—*Isaac Errett.*

Bro. Laurence W, Scott's new book on Christian Evidence is out and the *Messenger* has received a copy. It is a neatly bound volume of 300 pages, and is quite well written. We hesitate not to say that it will be

of great benefit to any of our preachers, or members to become familiar with the contents of this book. Bro. Scott has written in a pleasant style, and it will not weary you to read what he has said. As a scribe well versed in the law, he brings out of the treasure, things new and old, and gives us a taste of both ancient and modern infidelity. Send for the book. John Burns, publisher, St. Louis, Mo. Price $1.50.—*Christian Messenger, Texas.*

At a time like the present, it is extremely desirable to have, if possible, a compendious summary at hand of the main proofs of Christianity. An honest and manly attempt to supply this need has been made in *A Hand-Book of Christian Evidence*, by the Rev. Laurence W. Scott. The line of argument is more than able; it is really grand. It is followed up, moreover, with lively eloquence, noble bravery, and stout ability, such as are worthy of all praise. The whole is the result of a vast deal of reading and splendid common sense, coupled with a masculine skill in speaking to men. Taken altogether, or even in either one of its two parts, it is unanswerable, or even unassailable, as a vindication of the Christian faith.—*Sunday School Times.*

A Hand-Book of Christian Evidence; By Laurence W. Scott, the man who completely routed the imported champion of infidelity in Paris, Texas, more than four years ago. We have not yet read the book, but if he handles his subject as well as he did Dr. Stine, of Kansas, the lovers of truth all over the land will purchase the book and still owe the author a debt of gratitude, which they will be more ready to acknowledge than able fully to pay. Sold by agents. Address John Burns, publisher, 717 Olive street, St. Louis, Mo.—*Texas Baptist.*

St. Louis, February 9, 1880.

Dear Brother—Allow me to thank you for the copy of Brother Scott's work, *A Hand-Book of Christian Evidence.* It is a valuable publication and will greatly fortify and strengthen those of our workers whose unfortunate lot it is to have to labor in communities disturbed by foul infidel wranglings and quibblings. The matter of the book is judicious and the manner hearty and manly. I congratulate *you* on the mechanical execution of the work and the author on the shining success of his maiden effort in the theological field.

Joseph H. Foy,
Pastor Central Christian Church, St. Louis, Mo.

JOHN BURNS, PUBLISHER,

717 Olive Street, - - - - ST. LOUIS, MO.

NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY (The).

By W. K. Pendleton, W. T. Moore, C. L. Loos, J. W. M'Garvey, Isaac Errett, J. S. Lamar, R. Milligan and R. Richardson. *(In Press and in course of Preparation).* When completed to consist of eleven volumes. three volumes now ready.

MATTHEW AND MARK, - - - By Prof. J. W. M'GARVEY.
LUKE, - - - - - - - - - - - - By J. S. LAMAR.
HEBREWS, - - - - - - - - By President R. MILLIGAN.

The text used, same as Bagster's Critical English New Testament. Each volume crown octavo, to contain about 400 pages. *By Subscription.*

Per volume, cloth.....$2 00
" " sheep.....2 50
" " half calf.....3 00

AGENTS WANTED.

CAMPBELL, (ALEXANDER).

The Christian System, in reference to the Union of Christians and a Restoration of Primitive Christianity as plead in the current Reformation. By A. Campbell. 12mo, 358 pages, cloth.....1 50

CAMPBELL.

A Debate on the Roman Catholic Religion, held in Cincinnati, O., between Alexander Campbell and Right Rev. John B. Purcell, Bishop of Cincinnati. Taken down by reporters and revised by the parties. 12mo, 360 pages.....$1 50

CAMPBELL.

The Evidences of Christianity; A Debate between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland, and Alexander Campbell, containing an Examination of the "Social System" and all systems of Skepticism of ancient and modern times. Held in Cincinnati, O., in April, 1829. Complete in one volume. 12mo, 465 pages, cloth.....1 50

CORY, (N. E.)

The Polymathist. A work containing Essays on Pastoral Work; Scriptural Exegesis, and Homiletics with Briefs and Skeletons of Sermons, by ministers of various religious bodies. Arranged and edited by N. E. Cory. 12mo, cloth.....2 00

SMITH, (ELDER JOHN.

Life of Elder John Smith, with some account of the Rise and Progress of the Current Reformation. By John Augustus Williams. Crown, 8vo, 578 pages, cloth.....2 00
Sheep.....2 50

ON THE ROCK:

Or, Truth Stranger than Fiction. The story of a struggle after Truth as it is found in Christ. By D. R. Dungan, cloth.....1 50

VOICE OF THE SEVEN THUNDERS.

By Elder J. L, Martin. This is, perhaps, the most wonderful book of this book-making age. It is composed of a series of lectures on the Book of Revelations, by the late Elder J. L. Martin, and is evidently the best commentary upon the Apocalypse in the English language. It has received the very highest commendations of the press, both religious and secular. It has been called "The Apocalyptic Key." It is one of the most popular books ever published by our brethren. Eight editions of *one thousand* copies each have been sold, and the ninth edition is out and in store.....1 50

AGENTS WANTED.

ERRETT, (ISAAC).

Walks about Jerusalem. A Search after the Landmarks of Primitive Christianity. 212 pages, cloth $1 00

ERRETT.

Talks to Bereans. A series of twenty-three sermons, designed as a help and encouragement to that class of inquirers with whom the Scriptures are Divine authority. 12mo, 190 pages 1 00

COMMENTARY ON ACTS OF APOSTLES.

With a revised version of the text. By J. W. McGarvey. This work has received the highest commendation from nearly all the chief men among the Disciples of Christ, and many of other denominations. Its popularity is fully established by the large number which have been sold, and the numbers which are sold every year. One volume, 297 pages, octavo. Cloth 1 50

COMMUNINGS IN THE SANCTUARY.

By R. Richardson. This work consists of a series of Devotional Articles, republished, at the request of many friends, from the *Millennial Harbinger*, with improvements, amendments, and additions by the author, being valuable reading for all Christians, but especially valuable as a guide to religious meditations. 18mo, 179 pages, cloth, price 1 00

WILKES' TRACT ON PRAYER.

"I regard it the best exemplification of the subject published. *It is pure gold.*" J. B. McCleery. Price 10 cents; three for 25 cents.

UNION WITH CHRIST.

By G. W. Longan. Full of soul-inspiring thought. Christian, be sure and read it. Price, single copy 10

FRANKLIN'S TRACT.

CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE; OR SINCERITY SEEKING THE WAY TO HEAVEN. A Dialogue of unusual interest. It has been the means of leading thousands into the glorious light and liberty of the Gospel. Price 10

CHRISTIAN HYMNAL.

English cloth, single copy 1 00
" " per dozen 9 60
" " beveled boards, gilt side, vermillion edge 1 25
" " " " " " and edge—new design 2 00
Turkey antique, gilt edge 3 25
Turkey morocco, extra beveled, full gilt 3 75

CHRISTIAN HYMNAL. (Cheap Complete Edition, bound in Boards.) Single copy, by mail 50
Per dozen, by express 4 80
Per dozen, by mail 5 40
Per hundred, by express 40 00

ALL BOOKS AND TRACTS.

When in want of Books or Tracts, no matter where published, send to

JOHN BURNS,

717 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

BV
378
.M

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 029 789 302 6